

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^o XLIX. OCTOBER 1887.

ART. I.—LAY BAPTISM.

1. *Lay Baptism Invalid: to which is added Dissenters' Baptism Null and Void.* By R. LAURENCE, M.A. Reprinted from the Fourth Edition, 1723. With Additions and Illustrations, arranged and edited by WILLIAM SCOTT, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Christ Church, Hoxton. (London, 1841.)
2. *Letters on Lay Baptism.* By the Rev. DANIEL WATERLAND, D.D., and the Rev. E. KELSALL. Vol. vi. of *The Works of Waterland*, Edited by WILLIAM VAN MILDERT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Llandaff. (London, 1843.)
3. *A Scholastical History of the Practice of the Church in reference to the Administration of Baptism by Laymen.* By the Rev. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A. Vol. viii. of *The Works of Bingham*. (London, 1844.)
4. *A Matter of Life and Death: A Letter to all who profess and call themselves Christians.* By EDWARD C. BALDWIN, M.A. (London, 1879.)

It is often assumed that all baptism with water in the Name of the Blessed Trinity is valid, by whomsoever administered. This is to place Holy Baptism in a peculiar position among the Sacraments in this respect, that it treats the ordination of the minister as not essential to its validity. How entirely this is taken for granted may be illustrated from the writings of two great modern divines. The late Bishop Forbes of Brechin says, without any qualification :—

‘In case of necessity anyone, having the use of reason, who baptizes with water in the Name of the Holy Trinity is accepted—priest, deacon, layman, male, female, heretic, or excommunicate. Persons are not to be re-baptized who are baptized with the proper

VOL. XXV.—NO. XLIX.

B

370628

form and words by heretics, even by Calvinists who deny that baptism remits sin, unless there be a doubt of the sufficiency of the administration.¹

And, more recently, Canon Liddon has said :—

‘If the non-episcopal bodies have no true orders, they have unquestionably a true baptism, supposing the matter and words of that Sacrament to be duly administered ; since lay baptism is of undoubted validity.’²

When such expressions fall from men who are as eminent for their loyalty to the doctrine of the apostolic ministry as for their theological learning, it cannot be wondered at that the certain validity of lay baptism is constantly asserted, as though it were a question which had been decided by the consentient voice of Christendom. A book like Mr. Baldwin’s, which openly challenges this position, and argues the subject on its own merits, is not only rare, but is in danger of receiving scant attention from those who imagine that the popular view is endorsed by the authority of the Church. But, as a matter of fact, no general council has ever decreed the validity of baptism by any except the Church’s ordained ministers, and at no period has the laxer view been universally received.

There can be no proper dispute as to who originally received the authority to baptize, for it was explicitly given to the Apostles. Indeed, it seemed to be reserved exclusively to their ministry by the terms of the commission. For our Lord said to the eleven, ‘All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. . . . And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.’³ As man, Christ had received ‘power,’ or authority (*ἐξουσία*), and ‘therefore’ they were to go forth and baptize—that is, because His delegated authority was communicated to them by ordination. And so Laurence argues :—

‘Christ does not here say, Lo, I am with baptizing ; lo, I am with teaching, always, &c., but *Go ye*, baptizing, teaching, and *lo, I am*

¹ Forbes, *Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 495. But in another place he does not speak so decisively ; and only concludes, after briefly mentioning the arguments for and against the validity of lay baptism, that ‘in all cases where immediate death is apprehended before a lawful minister can be called, it is the safer side for any sufficiently informed person to administer it.’—*Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed*, p. 300.

² Liddon, *A Father in Christ*, 3rd edit. p. xxxix.

³ St. Matt. xxviii. 16, 18-20.

with
with
form
bapti
parti
are n
other
as th
one
degre
the p
tution
bapti
author

It
is of
be co
rule
does
chann
shoul
exten
a prop
law of
says :

‘H
has no
are in
and to
it.’²

Th
to giv
howev
been i
course
Scriptu
It l
Confer
on the
ance, a
to bapt
Lauren

¹ La
² Ib

with you. The promise of His presence and concurrence is to be with *them*; not with the acts separate from them, but with *them* performing and doing those acts; and because it is to be with them baptizing *always even unto the end of the world*, and because their particular persons were not to continue here so long, therefore *they* are necessarily *to be* in some respect *always*, &c. And this can be no otherwise than by succession; and then the succession must be such as that it may be justly called *them*. . . . If he who baptizes be not one of the *you*, an apostle or sent of Christ, in a higher or lower degree, to whom the promise was made, his act can claim no right to the promise, and therefore will be a contradiction to this sacred institution. So that it must necessarily follow that this institution requires baptism always to be administered by one vested with apostolic authority, either in whole or in part, to the end of the world.¹

It is urged, on the other side, that the command to baptize is of greater obligation than the command that baptism should be conferred by a duly ordained minister, and that the ordinary rule must therefore give way in cases of urgency. But this does not follow. If God has tied baptism to a particular channel, justice, as much as mercy, requires that its necessity should be limited by the opportunity of receiving it. To extend this principle to those who die unbaptized for lack of a proper minister seems more consistent than to infringe the law of ordination. And so many have contended. Laurence says:—

‘However He may dispense with the want of a sacrament, yet He has nowhere promised to give efficacy to those administrations which are in any respect contrary to the essentials of His own institutions, and to me it seems a mere foolhardiness and presumption to expect it.’²

The terms of the baptismal commission, therefore, seem to give no opening for lay baptism. This is not enough, however, of itself. It must be seen how that commission has been interpreted in the life of the Church. And first, of course, it must be considered whether other passages of Holy Scripture modify the apparent restriction.

It has been urged, as by Bancroft at the Hampton Court Conference, that 3,000 persons could not have been baptized on the day of Pentecost by the twelve Apostles without assistance, and that therefore laymen must have been employed to baptize under their direction.³ Neither Bishop Taylor nor Laurence admitted any difficulty in one man baptizing 250

¹ *Lay Baptism Invalid*, pp. 17, 18; comp. Baldwin, pp. 24–26.

² *Ibid.* p. cvii. ³ Acts ii. 41; Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 175.

persons in a single day.¹ St. Francis Xavier is reported to have said of himself, that he had baptized 10,000 Indians, with his own hand, in one month, and even greater numbers are sometimes attributed to him.² But if there is any difficulty in the matter, it does not follow that lay baptism was resorted to, for the 'seventy'—to say nothing of the 'hundred and twenty'—were not properly laymen, and might have helped the Apostles without breaking the law of orders.³

The next instance is that of St. Philip the deacon.⁴ Bingham uses the leave granted to deacons as a step towards his proof of the validity of lay baptism, because deacons have not received the commission of priests.⁵ But they are ordained clergy who hold a real commission, so far as it goes. 'A measure of the grace of the priesthood,' says Canon Carter, 'extends to the diaconate.' When he baptizes 'the deacon so far acts as a priest.'⁶ In the Church of England they certainly baptize not simply as laymen, but as ordained ministers.⁷ Maskell, who goes into the matter with great care, is of opinion that when they have been permitted to baptize, it has always been by virtue of their office, and not by express delegation apart from their orders.⁸ The question of lay baptism must not, therefore, be prejudiced by reference to the license granted to deacons, and this may be dismissed from further inquiry as not relevant to the discussion.

Next, the baptism of St. Paul by Ananias is brought forward as an instance of lay baptism.⁹ But, whether Ananias was a layman or not, the express commission by Divine vocation takes it out of the category of ordinary precedents. Again, St. Peter commanded Cornelius and his family to be baptized, apparently by 'the brethren from Joppa.'¹⁰ The Pseudo-Ambrose, supposed to be Hilary the Deacon, took this as an illustration of an assertion, which he does not otherwise support, that at first all Christians indiscriminately were allowed to baptize.¹¹ But Forbes thought the words need only mean that St. Peter ordered water to be brought to himself, with which he might administer the baptism;¹² and he

¹ Taylor, *Clerus Domini*, iv. 11; Laurence, *Dissenters' Baptism*, p. 197.

² Alban Butler, *Lives of the Saints* (Dublin, 1866), vol. xii. p. 30; Forbes, *Instructiones Historico-Theologicae*, X. xiii. 13.

³ St. Luke x. 1; Forbes, *ibid.*; Acts i. 15; Bennet, *Rights of the Clergy*, p. 233.

⁴ Acts viii. 12, 38.

⁵ Bingham, pp. 20-28.

⁶ Carter, *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, 3rd ed. p. 31.

⁷ *Book of Common Prayer*, 'Office for making of Deacons.'

⁸ Marshall, *Holy Baptism*, 2nd ed. pp. 177-189. ⁹ Acts ix. 18.

¹⁰ Acts x. 23, 48. ¹¹ *Comm.* in 1 Cor. i. 17, and Eph. iv. 11, 12.

¹² Forbes, X. xiii. 15.

and
bretl
fore,
at al

P

that

minis

alone

bisho

recon

beggi

he m

chum

In th

to ha

absen

died,

TI

were

not la

'The

right

out th

'With

priest

tinuou

down

stricts

'lawfu

stolic

gated

For

nearly

first wr

assertin

the bis

lawful

¹ For

of the Ch

² Dic

⁴ Ign

⁵ Ter

⁶ Jer

⁷ Arti

p. 32, and

⁸ Ter

and others, with greater probability, suggest that some of the brethren from Joppa were likely to have been clergy.¹ Therefore, this, like the other passages in the Acts, proves nothing at all decisively.

Passing from the Bible to ecclesiastical history, we find that the early Church laid stress upon the fact that the administration of baptism belonged by right to the episcopate alone. So strictly was the office sometimes reserved to the bishop, that the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, in 451, record a letter from the people of Edessa to their bishop, begging him to return from the council before Easter, that he might attend to the teaching and baptizing of the catechumens; but this, of course, concerned adult baptism.² In the same century, in the diocese of Milan, many are said to have died without baptism, because the bishop had been absent for several years; and, most of his suffragans having died, there was no one to administer it.³

The teaching of the Fathers, and the decrees of councils, were in accord with the spirit of these limitations. 'It is not lawful,' writes St. Ignatius, 'to baptize without the bishop.'⁴ 'The chief priest, who is the bishop,' says Tertullian, 'has the right of giving it: then presbyters and deacons, yet not without the authority of the bishop, for the honour of the Church.'⁵ 'Without the command of the bishop,' says St. Jerome, 'neither priest nor deacon has the right to baptize.'⁶ There is a continuous and consentient voice as to this, from the early days down to the present time, when the Church of England restricts the administration of sacraments to those who are 'lawfully called and sent to execute the same.'⁷ The apostolic commission extends only to those to whom it is delegated by the Apostles, through their successors.

For lay baptism itself there is no positive evidence for nearly two centuries. Tertullian, about the year 200, is the first writer who speaks of it. He accepted its validity. After asserting, as above, that the right to give baptism belongs to the bishop and his clergy, he continues by saying that it is lawful for the laity also to bestow it in cases of necessity.⁸

¹ Forbes, X. xiii. 15; Taylor, *Clerus Domini*, iv. 9; Bennet, *Rights of the Clergy*, p. 235; Waterland, p. 182.

² *Dict. Christ. Ant.* 'Baptism,' § 78.

³ Martene, I. i. 3.

⁴ Ign. *Ad Smyrn.* viii.

⁵ Tert. *De Bapt.* xvii.; comp. *Const. Apost.* III. i. 11.

⁶ Jer. *Dial. adv. Lucif.* iv.

⁷ Article 23; comp. *Preface to Ordinal*. See *Lay Baptism In valid* p. 32, and *Dissenters' Baptism*, p. 179.

⁸ Tert. *De Bapt.* xvii.

But he apparently altogether excludes women from this permission;¹ and he regarded baptism by heretics, by whom he means Gnostics, as entirely void.² The baptism which he recognized was, therefore, that by laymen in communion with the Church.

Tertullian seems to have fairly represented the mind of the early Church as to the invalidity of heretical baptism; and, although this is not necessarily at all the same thing as lay baptism, the two have become so inextricably involved in later controversies, that it is impossible to discuss one without following the history of the other. The *Apostolical Constitutions*, which indicate the discipline of about the third century, say that those who are baptized by heretics are not initiated, but polluted;³ and the *Apostolical Canons* lay down that a bishop or priest is to be deposed if he fails to baptize again those who have received heretical baptism.⁴ St. Clement of Alexandria also rejects it.⁵ A council at Iconium, in Phrygia, in about the year 231, did the same; and Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, who records the decree, says that this view had come down by tradition from Christ and the Apostles. Firmilian himself, while admitting the difference between the great heresies and the schisms of lapsed priests, thought that the baptism of both should be repeated.⁶ Another Phrygian council, at Synnada, in the first half of the century,⁷ and an African council, under Agrippinus, at Carthage, in about 215,⁸ also decided against heretical baptism. Africa, however, had not been so uniformly strict in the matter as the East. Both Firmilian and Cyprian imply that heretics had sometimes been received by the African Church without re-baptism. But this was a lax custom, apparently unsanctioned by any recognized canon.⁹

Heretical baptism was first formally received as valid, at Rome, under the pontificate of Stephen, in the middle of the third century. Stephen appears to have attempted to dictate to some Asiatic bishops that they were not to re-baptize those who had been baptized by heretics; but they rejected his

¹ Tert. *De Bapt.* xvii.; comp. *De Virg.* Vel. ix.

² *Ibid.* xv.; comp. *De Præscript. adv. Her.* xii. See Burton, *Lect. on Ecc. Hist.* vol. ii. pp. 265, 266.

³ *Const. Apost.* VI. iii. 15.

⁴ *Can. Apost.* 46, 47, 68.

⁵ Clem. Alex. *Stromata*, I. xix.

⁶ Firm. ap. Cyprian, Ep. lxxv. 7, 19, 22.

⁷ Dion. Alex. ap. Euseb. vii. He speaks of the decrees of 'many other' councils to the same effect.

⁸ Cyprian, Ep. lxxi. 4; lxxiii. 3.

⁹ Ep. lxxv. 19; lxxiii. 19; comp. Aug. *De Bapt.* III. v. 7; V. i. 1.

advice.¹ Soon after, in 254, some Numidian bishops, and Quintus, a bishop in Mauritania, consulted St. Cyprian on the subject. He laid it before a small council then sitting at Carthage, and they decided that heretical baptism was invalid.² A second Carthaginian council passed a similar decree in 256, and Cyprian sent a report of it to Stephen,³ who immediately broke off communion with the African Church. Thereupon Cyprian wrote on the matter to some of the Eastern bishops, and Firmilian replied entirely in accord with the Carthaginian doctrine,⁴ which was further endorsed by a larger council at Carthage in September of the same year.⁵ Stephen died soon after, and Dionysius of Alexandria had some amicable correspondence on the question with Pope Xystus, his successor,⁶ but nothing seems to have come of it. St. Jerome says that the African bishops afterwards rescinded their decrees; but, as Dr. Pusey points out, this is evidently a mistake, for St. Augustine would certainly have known of the change if it had occurred, and would have mentioned it, if he could, in support of his own contentions.⁷

The argument of St. Cyprian and his colleagues was briefly this. There is but one baptism, and that baptism is in the one faith. This one faith is to be found only in the Church, and therefore there only is the one baptism. Heresy cannot generate sons of God; the unclean cannot cleanse; the enemies of God cannot be entrusted with the administration of His grace. To allow baptism to be usurped by those who are not of the apostolic ministry would logically be followed by allowing the same as to other sacraments. Heretical baptism is therefore no baptism at all; and those who have received it must be, not re-baptized, but baptized, on coming over to the Church. Cyprian says that thousands were so baptized in Africa. He admitted that God might extend His indulgence to those who wrongly imagined themselves to have been duly baptized, but this gave no warrant to the Church to recognize heretical baptism. At the same time, in spite of his own very strong opinion, backed as it was by the general agreement of the African and Eastern bishops, he allowed the possibility of others arriving at a different conclusion.⁸

¹ Cyprian, Ep. lxxiv. 1; lxxv.; Euseb. vii. 3.

² Ep. lxx. lxxi.

³ Ep. lxxii.

⁴ Ep. lxxv.

⁵ Aug. *De Bapt.* III. iii.-ix.; VI.; VII. He records briefly the arguments of the several bishops, and replies to them *seriatim*.

⁶ Euseb. vii. 5, 9.

⁷ Jerome, *Adv. Lucif.* 23; Pusey, *Note on Tertullian*, Lib. of Fathers, p. 294.

⁸ See Epp. lxxi.-lxxv. lxxix. lxxx.

The reasoning of St. Cyprian might be applied in a measure to lay and dissenting baptism. But the heresies of the time were either led by bishops and priests who had lapsed, or else were almost heathen heresies outside the Church altogether. They were in no case parallel to modern dissent, and lay baptism, as such, did not come into the dispute at all. St. Basil, Firmilian's successor in the bishopric of Cæsarea, does indeed say that both he and Cyprian argued that those who separated from the Church lost the power to baptize, because they had 'become laymen.'¹ But, since neither bishop makes such a statement in any of the several epistles which are extant, it must be doubted whether St. Basil rightly expresses their views.² St. Cyprian in one place says that lapsed priests ought only to be received back to lay communion;³ but this is a very different thing from saying that they became laymen when they fell away. The real contention of the Eastern and African bishops was that the acts of heretics were null and void, because heresy put them entirely without the Church. Stephen's position can only be gathered imperfectly from the letters of his opponents; but he was probably at issue with them simply on the question of the effect of heresy. His point most likely was that it did not sever completely from Church communion, and therefore could not invalidate the ministrations of heretical priests. Firmilian, no doubt, represents him as holding that all baptism, in due form, was of avail by virtue of the invocation of the Name of the Blessed Trinity.⁴ But, as the dispute was entirely about baptism by clergy who had fallen into heresy, it is unlikely that when he wrote this he was seriously contemplating lay baptism. The controversy throughout turned upon heresy and not upon orders. Its bearing upon lay baptism is, therefore, strongest in its silence; for, if lay baptism had been practised in those days, it is incredible that neither side should have illustrated their arguments by reference to it.

At the Council of Arles, in 314, heretical baptism was discussed, and was decided to be valid, against the opinion of the Carthaginian Councils. On the other hand, the Council of Nicæa, in 325, decreed that the Paulianists and Samosatians were to be re-baptized, in confirmation of an earlier decree, supposed to be the 46th Apostolical Canon. St. Augustine and Pope Innocent say that these heretics did not baptize in

¹ Basil, *Ep. ad Amphiloc.* i.

² Bingham, p. 42; Kelsall in Waterland, p. 115.

³ *Ep.* lxxii. 2.

⁴ *Ap. Cyprian, Ep.* lxxv. 9, 18; comp. *Ep.* lxxiv. 1.

the Name of the Trinity,¹ while St. Athanasius distinctly asserts that they did ;² and, though the former seems most probable, the discrepancy of testimony leaves the motives which guided the council too uncertain for the canon to be used as any proof of the views of the council upon an irregular minister of baptism. But, anyhow, neither here nor at Arles was lay baptism under consideration, unless on the theory that heresy annulled orders, which Bingham persistently maintained, but never succeeded in proving.

So far as is known, then, Tertullian had been the solitary champion of lay baptism up to the beginning of the fourth century. A second definite acknowledgment of it is found in the canons of a Council at Elvira, in Spain, in 305,³ which decreed that a layman who was in full communion with the Church might baptize in cases of necessity.

To about the same period belongs the story of the young Athanasius baptizing his comrades at Alexandria, while playing at religious ceremonies on the seashore. The bishop, Alexander, is said to have taken counsel with his clergy, and then, having found that the proper form had been used, to have decided that the boys were validly baptized. The circumstance is narrated by Ruffinus, and is repeated from him by Sozomen.⁴ But Ruffinus, who was himself an inaccurate and credulous historian, only says that Alexander was 'reported' to have so determined the matter ; and Socrates, who relates the mimic games of the children, omits all mention whatever of the baptism.⁵ Moreover, the decision attributed to the bishop runs counter to the general tone of the discipline of the time, and it is not easy to make a very youthful age of Athanasius synchronize at all with the episcopate of Alexander. So much of the story as supports lay baptism is probably apocryphal.

Baptism controversies were rife in the later half of the fourth century, but they followed a somewhat different course in East and West, and the history from this point is best traced separately.

In the East the main question was about the baptism of heretics. St. Athanasius regarded baptism as 'unprofitable,' when the Divine Name was repeated without a right intention and salutary faith. St. Cyril of Jerusalem says, more clearly,

¹ Aug. *De Heres.* xlv. ; Inn. Ep. xxii. *Ad Episc. Maced.* 5. Comp. Conc. Arelat. II. can. 17.

² Ath. *Orat. adv. Arian.* ii. 43.

³ The date given on some manuscripts of the Acts themselves, viz. A.D. 324, is rejected as erroneous by Hefele and Dale.

⁴ Ruff. *Hist.* I. xiv. ; Soz. *Hist.* II. xvii.

⁵ Soc. *Hist.* I. xv.

that heretics must be re-baptized, because their first baptism was no true baptism at all.¹ St. Basil, in an epistle which is of exceptional importance, since it was accepted as canonical by the Council in Trullo, goes carefully into the subject. He absolutely rejects baptism by heretics, such as the Manichees, Valentinians, &c.; would himself reject that by schismatics, such as the Cathari and the Encratites, although willing to surrender his own judgment here to the custom of many Asiatic Churches; but decides in favour of the validity of baptism by priests who were under temporary excommunication.² St. Chrysostom restricts baptism to the priesthood, in terms which seem to preclude exceptions.³ St. Epiphanius protests against the re-baptism of Arians, simply because their separation from the Church had not been decreed by a general council. He mentions baptism by women as an error of Marcion and other heretics.⁴ The question of lay baptism is not dealt with by any of these Eastern writers; and the only one who even incidentally alludes to it is St. Basil, when he endorses the opinion which he fastens upon St. Cyprian, that heresy reduced priests to the rank of laymen, and therefore rendered their baptism invalid.

The Eastern councils of the same period passed canons about heretical baptism, but it is very difficult to be certain as to the grounds of their decisions. The Council of Laodicea, in or about 375, decreed that the baptism of Novatians, Photinians, and Quartodecimans was to be accepted, but the Phrygians or Montanists were to be re-baptized.⁵ This is sufficiently explained by the fact that the Montanists changed the words of administration;⁶ but it is also to be observed that they alone of the heretics mentioned did not rise in episcopacy, and so never had true orders. The second general council at Constantinople, in 381, decreed that the baptism of Arians, Macedonians, Sabbatians, Novatians, Quartodecimans, and Apollinarians was to be accepted, but not that of the Eunomians, Montanists, and Sabellians. Of these, all the first started in episcopacy, and none of the second, except the Eunomians; and the supposition that orders influenced the decision is favoured by the fact that the council gives a special reason for rejecting their baptism, that they used only

¹ Cyr. Hieros. *Catech.* i.

² Basil, *Ep. ad Amphiloc.* i.; Conc. Trull. can. 2.

³ Chrys. *De Sac.* III. v. 187. See Forbes, X. xiv. 8; Bingham, p. 41.

⁴ Epiph. *Adv. Hæres.* I. iii.; xxii.; II. xxix.; III. lix.

⁵ Conc. Laod. can. 7, 8.

⁶ Basil, *Ep. clxxxviii.*; Theophylact. *In Luc.* xxiv. 45-53.

one immersion, which apparently carried with it a change of the formula. After a long interval, the Council in Trullo, held at Constantinople at the end of the seventh century, added the Nestorians, an episcopal sect, to the list of those whose baptism was to be accepted, and the Paulianists, Manichees, Valentinians, and Marcionites to those who were to be re-baptized. Of these last, the Paulianists alone originated in episcopacy; but, as we have seen, their baptism had already been rejected at Nicæa, either for reasons of heresy or on account of a change in the form of administration. Bingham thought that these conciliar decisions were entirely based on the baptismal formula used.¹ Brett as positively held that all the early decrees on the subject rested simply on the question of the orders of the minister.² When read together with the writings of the Greek Fathers, the probability seems to be on Bingham's side rather than on Brett's; but, if the point of orders weighed in the determination, it serves to explain at once why some heretical baptisms were accepted and others not, which it is not easy to do by any comparison between the tenets of the several heresies themselves.

The question of lay baptism, at any rate apart from heresy, did not come before any of these councils, nor did it arise very early in the East. Bingham could produce no definite evidence in its favour before the beginning of the ninth century, when two canons of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, are quoted as allowing lay Christians to baptize when no priest can be obtained. They cannot be traced with certainty to any council, and it is doubtful what degree of authority they had; but Hermenopolus included them in his epitome of Greek canons in about the twelfth century.³ On the other hand, a council at Constantinople, in 1166, declared baptism by one who pretended to be a priest to be invalid;⁴ and individual writers are found against lay baptism, as Hamartolus in the ninth century, Glycas in the twelfth, Theodorus Scutariota in the thirteenth, Matthew Blastus in the fourteenth, though perhaps none of these were contemplating cases of necessity.⁵ Coming down later, Laurence appeals to the testimony of Arcudius, a Roman

¹ Bingham, pp. 63-66.

² Brett, *Enquiry into the Judgment of the Primitive Church*, p. 83.

³ See Bingham, pp. 92, 96, 340.

⁴ Conc. Const. ap. Matthew Blastus, *Syntag.* iii.

⁵ Cotelerius, *Not. in Const. Apost.* III. ix. See Bingham, pp. 93, 94, 96; Brett, *Letter to Author of Lay Baptism Invalid*, p. 5.

Catholic priest, in 1626, who says that the Easterns, as a rule, would rather let their children die unbaptized than suffer them to be baptized by a layman.¹ On the other side, Bingham quotes an article in a Greek confession of faith, printed in 1662, which allows any Christian man or woman to baptize in emergency.² Dr. Neale says that the Copto-Jacobites, the Syro-Jacobites, and some others still reject lay baptism absolutely, and that the Russian Church has only admitted it in comparatively recent times.³ The Constantinople rule now allows lay baptism by any orthodox person, male or female—that is, by anyone in full communion with the Eastern Church; and *The Duty of Parish Priests*, a manual issued by authority, directs the clergy to instruct their people how to administer the rite validly in circumstances of necessity.⁴ As regards others, Dr. Pusey says the Greek Church still accepts schismatical and rejects heretical baptism;⁵ but the dissenting sects of Russia are probably regarded as heretics and not as schismatics. Converts from the English or Roman branches of the Church are, we believe, always re-baptized unconditionally, for the Eastern Church has no conditional form. Therefore practically, in the East, every member of the orthodox Church receives baptism from the hands of an orthodox priest, except, to a limited extent, in the emergency of sudden death.

In the West, lay baptism came under consideration more definitely than in the East. St. Pacian, in the latter half of the fourth century, restricts the office of baptizing to the ministry, but he is not referring to cases of necessity;⁶ and his contemporary, St. Optatus, allows the validity of any baptism given in the due form, saying that the minister is not of equal importance with the Name of the Trinity and the faith of the receiver.⁷ That lax views on the matter were growing common is probable from a decree of the Council of Carthage, in 398, forbidding women to baptize,⁸ which could

¹ Arcudius, *De Bapt.* x. See Laurence, *Supplement to Lay Baptism Invalid* (London, 1714), §32; Brett, *Further Enquiry*, &c. p. 5.

² Bingham, p. 98, from Smith, *Account of Greek Church* (London, 1680), pp. 109, 118. Comp. *Second Part of Lay Baptism Invalid*, p. 239.

³ Neale, *History of Eastern Church*, Part I. p. 949.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 948.

⁵ Pusey, *Tertullian*, p. 281.

⁶ Pacian, *Ad Sempr.* Ep. i. See Waterland, p. 184.

⁷ Opt. *Cont. Parm.* v.

⁸ 'Mulier baptizare non præsumat,' Conc. Carth. can. 100. Gratian (*De Consecr.* iv.) and Peter Lombard (*Sent.* iv. 6) add the words 'nisi cogente necessitate'; but this was a deliberate gloss to pervert the strict meaning of the words. See Bingham, p. 48; Forbes, X. xiii. 23.

scarcely have otherwise been necessary; and the absence of any similar prohibition as to lay men may perhaps imply that it did not extend to them.

With regard to heretics, the decision of the Council of Arles was generally followed. Thus, a council at Carthage, in 348, while dealing with the Donatists, decided against re-baptizing any who had been baptized with water in the Name of the Trinity.¹ So also Arian and Novatian baptisms were accepted by Pope Siricius at the end of the fourth, and by Pope Innocent at the beginning of the fifth century.² On the other hand, St. Ambrose was disposed to reject all heretical baptism.³ The Luciferians, an episcopal sect, which rose in the later half of the fourth century, allowed the validity of Arian baptism, although they rejected the Arians altogether from the Christian Church.⁴ St. Jerome, in opposing them, maintained that this was illogical; that baptism and holy orders rest on the same footing, and must stand or fall together. It might be concluded from this that St. Jerome held ordination to be a necessary qualification in the minister of baptism, if it were not that he incidentally remarks that laymen are frequently allowed to baptize in cases of necessity.⁵ This shows that lay baptism had some degree of acceptance in his day.

St. Augustine, who has influenced Western theology more than any man since the days of the Apostles, added the weight of his judgment on the side of its validity. The Donatists, regarding themselves as the only true Church, re-baptized converts from the Catholic faith, and claimed for their support the authority of St. Cyprian. Augustine wrote against them, and, with many expressions of unfeigned admiration for the great martyr bishop, yet maintained that he was mistaken in rejecting heretical baptism, and that his opinion had been overruled by a general council.⁶ Replying to the Donatists, on their own grounds, he lays down that schism does not wholly sever from the Church;⁷ that the grace of orders

¹ Conc. Carth. can. 1. See *Dict. Christ. Ant.* vol. i. p. 38.

² Siric. Ep. i. *Ad Himerium Tarracoon.* i. Inn. Ep. xviii. *Ad, Alex. Ant.* iii. See Bingham, p. 71.

³ Amb. *De Init.* iv.

⁴ Jerome, *Adv. Lucif.* v.; Athanasius, *Ep. ad Antioch.* i.

⁵ *Adv. Lucif.* iv. v.

⁶ Aug. *De Bapt.* I. vii. 9; xviii. 28; II. vii. 12; ix. 14; III. x. 14; IV. vi. 8. He nowhere mentions the name of the council, but it is generally agreed that he must mean the Council of Arles, which was not, however, a general council, and therefore its authority would be less than St. Augustine attributed to it. See Pusey, *Tertullian*, p. 294.

⁷ *De Bapt.* I. viii. 10; VII. li. 99.

remains with priests who depart from its unity, and that they can therefore baptize.¹ When they do, it is not their particular heresy which generates sons in baptism, but the Church which generates children of God by their hands.² To support this view, he argues that, since Christ is the real Baptizer, the ministerial agent cannot interfere with the efficacy of the baptism by his own sin.³ At the same time, he distinguishes between the validity and the efficacy of the sacrament, and regards the grace of baptism by heretical and schismatical priests as in abeyance until the person whom they have baptized is reconciled to the Church.⁴ With less certainty, showing that lay baptism was still an open question, he gives it as his own, professedly immature, opinion that 'those persons possess baptism who have received it anywhere whatsoever, and from any persons whatsoever, if it were administered in the words of the Gospel, without hypocrisy, and were received with some degree of faith.'⁵ But he somewhat qualifies this broad liberty by refusing to give any opinion as to whether it would be valid if administered by one who was not himself baptized; or in jest, as in a play; or received, apart from any thought of the communion of the Church, in insincerity or mockery.⁶

From this time the laxer view prevailed in the West almost without exception. As regards heretical baptism by priests, the second Council of Arles, in 452, re-affirmed the Nicene canon for the re-baptism of the Paulianists; but it allowed that of the Bonosiani, another episcopal sect, because they used the valid form, which implies that the Paulianists had tampered with it, and that the formula was the crucial test of validity.⁷ So also St. Leo and Gennadius in the fifth century, Gregory I. at the end of the sixth, and Gregory II. at the beginning of the eighth, all decide the question simply

¹ *De Bapt.* I. i. 2; x. 14. Comp. Ep. xxiii. 2.

² *Ibid.* I. x. 14; xii. 19; xv. 23.

³ *Ibid.* III. iv. 6; *Cont. Pet.* I. v. 6; II. ii. 5; cviii. 247. St. Augustine would seem only to be applying this to the case of priests, where it is a legitimate argument, because of ordination. In Blunt's *Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theol.* pp. 405, 406, it is applied, under St. Augustine's name, to the case of lay and dissenting baptism, which is wholly different, since here there is no ministerial qualification. If true, the argument, as used here, would destroy the whole need of any ordained ministry at all. See Baldwin, p. 43.

⁴ *De Bapt.* III. x. 13; xiii. 18; IV. xiv.-xvii.; *In Joan.* vi. 8-26.

⁵ *Ibid.* VII. liii. 102.

⁶ *Ibid.* See also *Cont. Parm.* II. xiii. xxix.; and Aug. ap. Gratian, *De Consecr.* IV. xxi. xxxvi.

⁷ Conc. Arelat. II. can. 17.

on the ground of the form used.¹ As regards baptism by Christian laymen, it was allowed in necessity, among others, by Pope Gelasius at the end of the fifth century, by Isidore, bishop of Seville, at the beginning of the seventh, by St. Bernard in the twelfth;² and the Council of Arles, in 1260, directed curates to teach their people how to baptize in due form,³ as also did councils at Ravenna in 1311 and 1314,⁴ and at Salzburg in 1420.⁵ Indeed no opposite opinion seems to have been expressed. There is not quite the same unanimity as to baptism by women; for, though Urban II. at the end of the eleventh century is represented, in the canon law, as allowing it,⁶ Hugo of St. Victor, in the twelfth, speaks of it as still a disputed point.⁷ Grave doubts were felt as to pagan baptism. Gregory II. directed that it was not to be accounted valid, and so did his successor, Gregory III.⁸ But Nicolas I., in the ninth century, says that baptism by a Jew should not be repeated, if conferred in the Name of the Trinity;⁹ and, as time went on, all hesitation disappeared. St. Thomas Aquinas, in the thirteenth century, examines each case of irregular baptism, and successively allows its validity, when administered by a deacon, a Christian layman, a woman, and by one who is himself unbaptized, a Jew, or a pagan, if it be done with the Church's intention.¹⁰ John of Ragusa maintained the same doctrine before the Council of Basle, in 1433.¹¹ Scotus also took this view;¹² and it was authoritatively decreed by Pope Eugenius in the Council of Florence in 1439.¹³ The Council of Trent, in the sixteenth century, followed in the wake of the Council of Florence, still, however, requiring the intention of the Church.¹⁴ The canon law, compiled under Gregory XIII., at the end of this century, decreed the same extensive validity in every case;¹⁵ and so does the Roman Ritual,¹⁶ with the further qualifying clause,

¹ Leo, Ep. xcii. *Ad Rustic.* 18; xxxvi. *Ad Leon. Raven.* 2; lxxvii. *Ad Nicet.* 7. Gennadius, *De Eccles. Dogmat.* lii. Greg. I. Ep. lxi. *Quirino Episc.* Greg. II. Ep. xiv. *Ad Bonif.* 8.

² Gelas. Ep. ix. *Ad Episc. Lucan.* 8. Isid. *De Offic. Eccles.* II. xxiv. Bern. Ep. ccccliii. *Ad Henric. Archidiacon.*

³ Conc. Arel. can. 2.

⁴ See Kelsall in Waterland, p. 83 note.

⁵ Conc. Salz. can. 28.

⁶ *Decret.* II. xxx. 3.

⁷ *Dict. Christ. Ant.* 'Baptism,' § 81.

⁸ Greg. II. Ep. xiv. *Ad Bonif.* 23; Greg. III. Ep. i. *Ad Bonif.* 1.

⁹ Nicolas, *Resp. ad Consulta Bulgor.* 104, ap. *Decret.* III. iv. 24.

¹⁰ Aquinas, *Summa*, III. lxvii. 1, 3, 4, 5.

¹¹ See Martene, I. i. 3.

¹² Scotus, *Sent.* IV. vi. 1.

¹³ Eugen. *Decret. ad Armenos.*

¹⁴ Conc. Trid. Sess. vii. *De Bapt.* iv

¹⁵ *Decret.* III. iv. 20, 21, 23, 28, 32, 36.

¹⁶ *Rit. Rom. Tit. de Min. Bapt.*

'unless for a reasonable cause it seems otherwise to the bishop.'¹

Thus, in the Roman Church, the principle of lay baptism is carried theoretically to an extreme form; but the reservation of intention, and the discretion given to the bishop, leave great room for elasticity in applying the theory to practice. As a matter of fact, her clergy guard the validity of baptism with a most rigid scrupulosity; and, like the Easterns, re-baptize, though in a conditional form, all converts from other parts of Christendom, even when there can be no question whatever as to the matter and words having been duly used. The Roman acceptance of an irregular minister, although it seems so emphatic, practically scarcely exists except on paper. In reality, probably every living member of her communion has, at some time or other, been baptized by a Roman priest.

In England lay baptism had established itself early. Archbishop Theodore, in the seventh century, while decreeing a sentence of excommunication on any layman who baptized unnecessarily, says: 'It is allowed to all the faithful to baptize, compelled by necessity, when by chance they have found that dying persons have not been baptized.' And, in 'the greatest necessity,' he allowed that women also might administer the sacrament.² The *Excerptions* of Ecgbriht, Archbishop of York, in about 740, repeat almost the same words.³ The Sarum and York Manuals give the same liberty; and Lanfranc, in the eleventh century, bears witness to the general permission.⁴ In the thirteenth century, for some reason, canons on the subject abound, and are all to the same effect, often directing the clergy to teach their people how to baptize. Maskell quotes from Hostiensis, Lyndwood, and the *Pupilla Oculi*, as summing up the opinion of canonists in the same sense.⁵ The question of baptism by those outside the Church does not appear in the English canons; but so far as baptism by Churchmen in cases of necessity is concerned, their voice was absolutely unanimous.

In the disordered times of the Reformation opinions were divided upon this, as upon every other subject. Abroad the Lutherans accepted lay baptism.⁶ So did Zuinglius, allowing

¹ *Rit. Rom.* Rubric on Bapt. of Adults. See Pusey, *Tertullian*, p. 295.

² *Theod. Penit.* xliii. 3; xlviii. 21.

³ Ecgb. *Can.* 95; Johnson, *Eng. Can. Ang. Cath. Lib.* vol. i. p. 235.

⁴ See Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. i. p. 361.

⁵ *Host. Summa*, III. xlii. 3; Lynd. *Provinciale*, I. 7; III. 24; *Pup. Oc.* II. ii. See Maskell, pp. 211-215.

⁶ Bingham, p. 100.

it by women in necessity,¹ though afterwards the Helvetic Confession in 1566 forbade any but men to administer it,² Calvin, in a letter dated Nov. 13, 1561, allows baptism by men and rejects that by women; but in the *Institutes* he inclines to reject lay baptism altogether,³ and his followers adopted this stricter view.⁴

Whatever doubts were felt by individuals, the compilers of the first English Prayer-Books showed no disposition to interfere with the prevailing custom. In 1549, 1552, and 1559 the direction as to private baptism, 'when the need shall compel,' ran thus :

'Let them that be present call upon God for His grace and say the Lord's Prayer, if the time will suffer. And then one of them shall name the child and dip him in the water, or pour water upon him, saying these words, *N. I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.* And let them not doubt but that the child so baptized is lawfully and sufficiently baptized, and ought not to be baptized again in the church.'

There would seem to be no room for doubt that by 'one of them' a layman is contemplated, at any rate inclusively with a priest, especially as both the Sarum Office and the *Consultation* of Hermann, which were the two chief sources of the English service, expressly provide for lay baptism.⁵

To what extent laymen actually baptized in post-Reformation times it is difficult to determine. It certainly remained the custom, under the English Prayer-Book, to administer an oath to midwives, by which they pledged themselves to baptize in the due form. Baptism by women was at any rate common enough for Sandys, Archbishop of York, to think it necessary to urge that the Queen should take measures to put a stop to it.⁶ If it had been unusual, the Protestant reformers would scarcely have made it such a frequent topic of complaint as they did.⁷ Whitgift, at that time Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, published in 1574 his celebrated *Defence of the Answer to the Admonition*, in which he replied categorically to sundry objections by Cartwright, and defended lay baptism

¹ Zuing. *De Bapt.* ii. See Bingham, p. 103, and Whitgift, *Defence of Answer to the Admonition*, Parker Soc. vol. ii. pp. 511, 526.

² Conf. Helv. Art. 20.

³ Calv. *Inst.* IV. xv. 20-22.

⁴ See Bingham, p. 105.

⁵ See Proctor, *History of Book of Common Prayer*, 9th ed. pp. 387, 390, notes.

⁶ Sandys, *Works*, Parker Soc. p. 433; see also his will, p. 448.

⁷ See *Zurich Letters*, Parker Soc. vol. i. pp. 164, 178; vol. ii. pp. 130, 149, 356, 357, 361; Bullinger, *Decades*, vol. v. p. 370.

VOL. XXV.—NO. XLIX.

in cases of necessity.¹ He held his judgment somewhat in suspense as to the lawfulness of its administration by women, thinking the rubric in the Prayer-Book meant 'that private baptism is rather to be ministered by some minister (which in time of necessity may soonest be come by) than by any woman.'² But, whether lawful or not, he maintained that all baptism with water and the right words was valid, by whomsoever administered, and that the most learned men in the Church had always been of this opinion.³

The subject came prominently before Convocation in 1575; and, among the articles passed by the two houses in that year, the twelfth decreed that—

'Private baptism, in case of necessity, is only to be ministered by a lawful minister or deacon, called to be present for that purpose, and by none other.'⁴

It is doubtful whether this article was ever promulgated.⁵ At any rate, it did not close the controversy. The Puritans were still actively protesting against baptism by women ten years later,⁶ while better Churchmen as a rule opposed their objections. Thus, Hooker, in 1594, in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, warmly defended lay baptism, including that by women.⁷ His argument is defective in some points, but it has no doubt largely influenced later English opinion, by the weight of his name. Others followed on the same side. Abbott, afterwards Archbishop, in his Oxford lectures in 1597, accepted its validity, though strong as to its irregularity.⁸ The University of Oxford, in their answer to the Millenary Petition in 1603, also affirmed its validity, even 'if perchance' it were administered by women, contrary to the spirit of the Prayer-Book.⁹ The Vice-Chancellor, and heads of houses at Cambridge, endorsed this answer with their approval in a formal letter to the Oxonians, dated October 7, 1603.¹⁰

The matter received much attention at the Hampton

¹ Whitgift, vol. ii. pp. 519–540.

² *Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 493. Comp. vol. ii. p. 540.

³ *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 528; Strype, *Life of Whitgift*, vol. iii. p. 139.

⁴ *Remains of Grindal*, Parker Soc., p. 188.

⁵ See Scott, Preface to *Lay Baptism Invalid*, p. xxxvi.

⁶ Strype, *Life of Whitgift*, vol. i. p. 386.

⁷ *Eccles. Pol.* V. lxi. lxii.

⁸ Abbott, *De Bapt.* Prælect. ii. (Oxon. 1597) pp. 70, 99. See Bingham, pp. 111, 115.

⁹ *Answer of University of Oxford to the Petition of Ministers of the Church of England desiring Reformation of Ceremonies* (Oxford, 1603), p. 11.

¹⁰ See *Answer to Exceptions against the Bishop of Oxford's Charge by Mr. L. and Dr. B.* (London, 1713), p. 122.

Court Conference in 1604. In the result, the bishops agreed to certain alterations, whereby the Prayer-Book gave explicit authorization only to baptism by a 'lawful minister.' The title of the office for private baptism was expanded by adding the words, 'by the minister of the parish, or any other lawful minister that can be procured.' In the rubrics, for 'baptize not their children at home,' there were substituted the words, 'procure not their children to be baptized at home;' and the phrase, 'them that be present,' was replaced by 'the minister that be present;' and 'one of them shall name the child and dip him in water,' by 'the child being named by some one of them that is present, the said lawful minister shall dip it in the water;' together with one or two other slight alterations of the same kind.¹ And thus the rubrics were left in 1661, except for a few trifling amendments, the chief of which was the omission of the restrictive words from the heading of the office.

It cannot be seriously doubted, although it has been questioned,² that a 'lawful minister' here means one in holy orders. But it does not follow from this that the Church of England in 1604 repudiated the validity of lay baptism. The Roman office, exactly in the same way, speaks of the minister only as 'sacerdos,' and yet allows a layman to baptize in emergency. The restriction affects the regularity, but not necessarily the validity, of a lay administration.

One of the inquiries by which the sufficiency of a private baptism is to be tested is, 'By whom was this child baptized?' It has been argued that this question would be unnecessary, unless it were material to the validity that the baptizer should have been a 'lawful minister.'³ But the same question stood in precisely the same position in the original offices of Edward VI. and Elizabeth, which certainly allowed lay baptism. The object of the inquiry, therefore, can only be to elicit such information as may enable the clergyman to judge whether all is likely to have been done in due order, which can be the only intention of the corresponding question, 'Who was present when this child was baptized?' Indeed, this is put almost beyond doubt by the insertion, in 1604, of the clause as to 'some things essential to this sacrament,' not before

¹ Cardwell, *Conferences*, pp. 139, 172, 174-176, 219.

² Maskell, *Holy Baptism*, p. 233; Phillimore, *Book of Church Law*, p. 43.

³ Scott, Preface to *Lay Baptism Invalid*, p. xlvii.; Blunt, *Dissenters' Baptism and Church Burials* (Exeter, 1840), p. 103; Burgess, *Reflections on the Judgment of Sir H. Nicholl*, p. 29. It was also urged by counsel in the case of *Mastin v. Escott*.

these inquiries, but after them, and before those as to the 'matter' and 'words.' At the same date was added the rubric which orders conditional baptism simply 'if they which bring the infant to the church do make such uncertain answers to the priest's questions as that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with water, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (which are essential parts of baptism).'¹ And when, in 1661, the office for baptizing adults was drawn up, the reason assigned for its need was simply the growth of Anabaptism, whereby many had grown up unbaptized. If the revisers had considered lay baptism invalid, they would certainly, as Maskell says, have given as a further reason the growth of irregular ministrations, whereby many had already in those days grown up without baptism by a 'lawful minister.'² It is difficult to arrive at any other conclusion than that the intention was to discourage, but not to condemn, lay baptism.

Various opinions, however, were still held by divines of note. Jeremy Taylor was strongly against lay baptism, and believed that the omission of its sanction in the Prayer-Book was tantamount to its rejection.³ Dean Comber was also opposed to it.⁴ On the other hand, Thorndike fully accepted its validity when administered by a Christian.⁵ So also did Sparrow and Bramhall.⁶

Somewhat later than these came the pamphlet controversy which Roger Laurence either initiated or fomented. He is described as a 'book-keeper,' or merchant's clerk, in London,⁷ who, having received dissenters' baptism in his infancy, was, at his own special request, baptized hypothetically by the curate of Christ Church on March 31, 1708.⁸ In 1710 he published the first edition of *Lay Baptism Invalid*. The most original part of the book is written with a pedantic affectation of mathematical accuracy, in propositions, with definitions, axioms, demonstrations, and corollaries, after the manner of

¹ Maskell, pp. 235, 236; Sir H. Jenner, *Report of Case of Mastin v. Escott*, by W. C. Curteis (London, 1841), p. 282.

² Maskell, p. 245; Sir J. Nicholl, *Kemp v. Wickes*, p. 31.

³ Taylor, *Ductor Dubitantium*, III. iv. 15, § 2.

⁴ Comber, *Comp. to Temple*, ed. 1701, p. 602.

⁵ Thorndike, *Rights of the Church*, iii. 23; *Covenant of Grace*, xix. 12; *Laws of the Church*, viii. 11.

⁶ Sparrow, *Rationale*, ed. 1839, p. 242; Bramhall, *Works*, Ang. Cath. Lib. vol. ii. pp. 81, 618.

⁷ Bishop White Kennet, *The Wisdom of looking Backward*, &c (London, 1715), pp. 88, 221.

⁸ *Lay Baptism Invalid*, p. lxxii. and Scott's Preface, p. vii.

Euclid, which make it tedious to read. But there is force in its arguments, and it attracted attention. It apparently led Bishop Burnet to preach in support of lay baptism at Salisbury, on November 5 and 7 of the same year; Bishop Fleetwood wrote a formal reply to it in 1711;¹ and Bishop Talbot in his Charge at Oxford also defended lay baptism. Laurence, who was always ready to rush into print, published separate answers to each of the three bishops,² and in 1712 brought out a third and enlarged edition of *Lay Baptism Invalid*. A more formidable opponent than his episcopal adversaries came on the field in the same year in the person of Bingham, who thought the controversy of sufficient importance to make him suspend his work upon the *Antiquities* while he wrote the first part of his *Scholastical History of Lay Baptism*, with a special appendix against Laurence's book.

Meantime the subject had come before the Convocation of Canterbury in 1712, in connexion with some utterances of Dodwell, Camden Professor at Oxford, who was for re-baptizing dissenters. Archbishop Tenison, with some of the bishops, drew up a resolution against this opinion; but, owing to the fear of Archbishop Sharp, of York, that it might encourage irregular baptism, it was not brought before the northern Convocation. In the southern province it was passed by the Upper House, with some dissentients. It was sent down to the Lower House on May 14, but the majority there were opposed to considering it, and thus Convocation was saved from committing itself rashly to a decision; and no attempt has since been made to obtain a synodical declaration on the subject. The controversialists, however, were too excited in the dispute to suspend their judgment, like Convocation, and carried on the controversy for some years.

The discussion was indirectly revived, in the present century, by two cases in the law courts. The first was an action brought against the Rev. J. W. Wickes, rector of Wardley-cum-Belton, for refusing to bury a child who had been baptized by a Calvinistic Independent preacher.³ It was tried in the Arches Court, and Sir John Nicholl, the official principal, gave judgment on December 11, 1809, against the defendant.

¹ *The Judgment of the Church of England in the Case of Lay Baptism and of Dissenters' Baptism*, published anonymously.

² Against Burnet: *Sacerdotal Powers*, 1711, with an appendix containing a Letter from Dr. Brett. Against Fleetwood: *Dissenters' and other unauthorised Baptisms null and void by the Articles, Canons, and Rubrics of the Church of England*, 1712, 2nd ed. 1713. Against Talbot: *The Bishop of Oxford's Charge considered*, 1712.

³ *Judgment in Kemp v. Wickes*, pp. 5, 6.

The judgment was not particularly able. It discussed the question of lay baptism; but Nicholl's investigation of the subject was incomplete, and, from his point of view, it was not of much importance, since he maintained that a dissenting minister was more than a layman, under the State Toleration Acts,¹ and that 'unbaptized' in the Burial Service Rubric meant unbaptized by anyone whatsoever. A similar suit was tried in 1841, when the Rev. T. S. Escott, vicar of Gedney, in Lincolnshire, was prosecuted in the Arches Court, by Mr. Mastin, a farmer and Wesleyan class teacher, for refusing to bury a child who had been baptized by a Wesleyan minister. No stress was laid by the counsel on any supposed clerical claims of the minister;² and, therefore, the question turned almost entirely on the validity of lay baptism. Sir Herbert Jenner (afterwards Jenner-Fust) delivered judgment on May 8, 1841, against Escott, chiefly on the ground that lay baptism was admittedly acknowledged in the Church of England up to 1604, and that the later rubrics had not formally rescinded its acceptance. An appeal was made to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and Lord Brougham gave judgment on July 2, 1842, sustaining the decision of the Arches Court; but the subject was not one upon which he had any original knowledge, and he did not contribute anything of value to its elucidation.

Thus, the question stands at present to some extent an open one in the Church of England. Practically, however, while less bound to allow lay baptism than the Roman Church, or perhaps even the modern Greek Church, her clergy are far more ready to accept the validity of irregular baptism than the clergy of any other part of Christendom. For, whereas these always find an excuse for re-baptizing their converts, even from other Catholic communions, the English clergy, with rare exceptions, seem to admit almost any schismatical baptism without demur, and almost without inquiry even as to the due use of the essential matter and words.

It is singular that a subject of such vast importance, discussed in some form or other, at intervals, through nearly the whole course of Church history, should still be open to dispute. It is impossible, on the one hand, to ignore the grave questions of principle involved in accepting the validity of lay baptism; but it is equally impossible, on the other hand, to disregard the constant, if hesitating, tendency of the Church to allow it, especially in the later days of the West. A final

¹ *Judgment in Kemp v. Wickes*, p. 36.

² *Curteis, A full Report of the Case of Mastin v. Escott, &c.* p. 11.

judgment upon such a serious and debated point can only now be given by a general council.

All that can be attempted, then, in conclusion, is to suggest the practical bearing of the inquiry upon the treatment of baptism by irregular ministers. These may all be classed under one or another of five heads: 1. Heathen, Jews, and unbaptized persons. 2. Heretical and schismatical priests. 3. Lay Churchmen. 4. Women. 5. Dissenters.

1. To allow baptism by heathen or the unbaptized is no doubt a logical deduction from confining the essentials absolutely to the matter and words. But it must be remembered that the earlier decrees which recognize lay baptism usually qualify the recognition by the condition that the baptizer should himself be a Christian; and there is something so anomalous in the idea that one who is outside the divine covenant can admit others into it, that it does certainly seem as if the liberty must here be extended too far.¹

2. The early Eastern and African Churches were clearly against accepting the ministrations of heretical or schismatical priests under formal excommunication. The maturer mind of the Church has been in the direction of such a full recognition of the indelible character of orders, that the general view now is that their acts must permanently carry the force of their sacramental commission. Therefore it would seem that those who are baptized in an episcopal schism, like that of Bishop Colenso or Bishop Beccles, need nothing more than reconciliation with the Church, though, until such reconciliation, it may be maintained, with St. Augustine, that the grace of their baptism is in abeyance.

3. Baptism by lay Churchmen presents greater difficulties. For, whatever be the sanction of custom, there is the crucial objection that baptism belongs to the bishops as successors of the Apostles, and the laity have received no ministerial authority as the priesthood have. Kelsall dealt with the question as though it were only a matter of discipline, in which the bishops could give leave to the laity if they wished.² But sacraments require more than a disciplinary permission for their administration. As Waterland pointed out in his reply, and as Laurence and others maintained, the only apostolic way of giving a commission to minister sacraments is by ordination, and this makes a man a clergyman in perpetuity,

¹ Lyndwood, however, does not hesitate to extend the validity of lay baptism even to this extreme case: 'et idem dico,' he says, 'de non baptizato baptizante' (lib. i. tit. 7, p. 41, Oxford ed. 1679).

² Kelsall in Waterland, p. 97.

and takes him out of the category of laymen.¹ Tertullian felt this so strongly that he was obliged to rest his plea for lay baptism on the doctrine of the lay priesthood.² But there is a clear distinction between the priesthood of the laity and that of the clergy. The former are priests 'unto God,' 'to offer up spiritual sacrifices,' upwards;³ while the clergy are in addition priests unto men, to act as channels of God's grace downwards.⁴ Baptism distinctly belongs to the second kind of priesthood, and therefore not to the priesthood of the laity. Nevertheless, in the face of the long and wide acceptance of lay baptism, it is the clear duty of a lay Churchman, in a case of necessity, to lay aside whatever scruples he may feel, and reverently to baptize the dying person. In the event, however, of recovery, it is surely best to take measures to supply whatever may be lacking through the irregularity of the administration.

4. It has never been given to women to exercise the office of a ministerial priest, and, therefore, greater hesitation has always been felt in allowing them to baptize. Still, seeing that their baptism is accepted in theory in the Roman Church, and in some parts at least of the Greek, and that it was at one time formally sanctioned in the English Church, and has been defended by some of her great theologians since, it is certainly the duty of a Church woman, in the absence of a Church man, to baptize in urgent necessity. But whatever doubts hang round lay baptism are stronger in this case than in the other; and, therefore, there is a proportionately greater need to supply its possible defects if there is an occasion for doing so.

5. No Church layman in these days is likely to baptize without real necessity, and the cases will therefore be comparatively rare. But it is not so with dissenters' baptism. Their so-called ministers baptize constantly, without any necessity, and with far less right than a layman in communion with the Church. Mr. Baldwin sums up the special objections to it clearly. While admitting that God may possibly, and perhaps probably, accept baptism as valid when it is administered 'in case of extreme danger of death,' by a layman 'in communion with the ministry of the Church,' 'acting under the protection of the bishop, and as the lawful minister's deputy,' he says:

'The case is wholly and radically different when a "minister" of a religious sect presumes to "baptize." He is *not* in communion with

¹ Waterland, pp. 144, 145.

² Tert. *Exhort. ad Cast.* vii.

³ Rev. i. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 5.

⁴ St. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19; St. John xx. 21; 2 Cor. v. 20; vi. 1.

the ministry of the Church ; he is *not* acting under the protection of the bishop, but rather in opposition to the bishop ; he does *not* act as the deputy of the lawful minister ; neither does he baptize because of extreme danger of death. He takes upon himself the office of baptizing, simply and solely because for some reason or other he imagines himself, or is imagined by other people, to have a kind of ministerial power about him.¹

Some of these objections may perhaps be fairly met. The restriction of lay baptism to cases of necessity is a regulation of order, and probably the contempt of this regulation would not affect the validity of the act, although it must add to the responsibility of the officiant. Again, although the dissenter certainly does not baptize as a deputy of the lawful minister, he so far acts for him as that he no doubt means to do what Christ intended to be done, which meets any reasonable doctrine of intention. The want of episcopal authority is made much of by all opponents of dissenters' baptism. But no one has proper authority to administer a sacrament except by ordination. If a lay Churchman, who has never been 'sent' to baptize, nevertheless may baptize, it is but a small step further, judged merely by the authority of commission, to allow that some one else who has equally not been sent may also do the same. For all baptized persons are in some sense members of the Church, and dissenters may be supposed to have inherited from the mother whom they have forsaken such powers of baptizing as belong to the laity of the Church, and to be handing them on with an increased irregularity, but still with a remote kind of validity. But this can only be true on the assumption that lay baptism is valid. Dissenters' baptism certainly rests on a precarious foundation ; and it is obvious that a lay communicant is a far safer person to administer the sacrament than a dissenting preacher, who at best is an excommunicate layman.

It is popularly supposed that the defects of lay or dissenting baptism are supplied by confirmation ;² but this is not accurate. The ancient decrees about the reception of persons baptized by heretics and schismatics do certainly, in many instances, order either the imposition of hands or, in the East, anointing with oil.³ The latter, no doubt, means confirmation, generally speaking ; but the former was a usual ceremony in reconciling penitents, and probably reconcilia-

¹ Baldwin, p. 26.

² Scott, *Laurence*, p. xlvi. from Nathaniel Marshall ; Bingham, pp. 72-80 ; Hook, *Church Dict.* p. 433.

³ See Morinus, *De Pœn.* IX. ix. x. ; *Parochial Missions*, edited by mission priests of St. John Evan. pp. 134-141, from Morinus.

tion and not confirmation is the intention of many of the canons. Morinus, however, who goes into the subject at length, was disposed to consider that confirmation was meant in all the cases. But, if this is correct, such confirmation was not used as a remedy for the defects of an irregular baptism, but merely in the same way as any baptized person requires it. Confirmation presupposes valid baptism, and the very fact of ordering it would amount to an express recognition of the irregular baptism. If lay or dissenting baptism is not valid in itself, it certainly is not made valid by confirmation or any other supplementary rite.

The difficulty which many feel in even considering the possibility of doubt as to the validity of irregular baptism is that they think it involves consequences of too serious a kind to be consistent with the security of the Church's constitution. They urge that, if lay baptism is condemned, vast numbers of professing Christians must in fact be unbaptized, while living in the communion of the Church and partaking of her sacraments; that their salvation would thus be imperilled, unconsciously to themselves; that many such have received the ordination of priests, and some the consecration of bishops; that their own ordination would then be invalid, and thus all their ministrations to others would be invalid also, and so invalid baptisms, confirmations, absolutions, eucharists, and ordinations would be multiplied in the Church, until no one could be certain of the validity of any sacramental rite whatever.¹ Laurence, Brett, and Waterland sought to escape from this dilemma by maintaining that an unbaptized person might hold a true commission by ordination, and therefore could validly administer sacraments which he had never received himself.² They propounded this theory with hesitation, and it was received with little favour. But there is no need to resort to such a solution of the difficulty. A rejection of dissenters' baptism must be qualified by common sense. If the proper ministration has failed through ignorance, there may be the most implicit belief that God will supply the defect. Even St. Cyprian, the stern advocate for baptismal discipline, allowed this, and so did the strictest of the eighteenth-century controversialists.³ It would be an intolerable doctrine that where irregular baptism has been

¹ Abbott, *De Bapt.* ii. Comp. Whitgift, vol. ii. p. 527.

² *Lay Baptism Invalid*, pp. 90-103; Brett, *Enquiry*, p. 111; Waterland, pp. 79, 215-226.

³ Cyprian, Ep. lxxiii. 23; *Lay Baptism Invalid*, p. 64; Hickes, *Letter to the Author*, 3rd ed. of *Lay Baptism Invalid*, p. xxxviii.

administered and received in all good faith, it should be rendered absolutely nugatory by an error of which neither administrator nor recipient were conscious. No uneasiness need be felt about the consequences of those lay and schismatical baptisms which have thus been given, and for which no remedy can be applied; but this does not render it any the less necessary to do whatever can be done to put a baptism beyond the reach of doubt when there is the means and the opportunity for doing so.

Such a means certainly exists in the conditional formula provided in the Prayer-Book. This completely secures that a person shall be validly baptized, without running any risk of the sacrilege of re-baptization. Maskell thought that clergy had no right to fall back on such an easy expedient.¹ No doubt the earlier ages endeavoured to fix the validity or invalidity of particular classes of irregular baptism, and did not leave them open to a conditional remedy. But no conditional form existed in those days. It was suggested by the exigencies of circumstances, and is only first found in the statutes of St. Boniface, Archbishop of Mayence, in the eighth century.² Such a formula is still unknown in the East. Now that we have it, there is no reason why it should not be used in any case of reasonable doubt. The Scotch Church in 1838 decided that the hypothetical form might be used for anyone who should have scruples as to the validity of his own schismatical baptism.³ Dr. Pusey recommended its adoption in all uncertain cases, and, indeed, assumed that it would be used for those baptized by dissenters. He says:

‘The practice now adopted by the Scotch Church and in our own with regard to persons baptized by such as are not only in schism, but never received any commission to baptize (a case to which there is no parallel in the early Church), unites the advantages of the Latin and Greek practice: of the Latin in that it avoids the risk of real re-baptizing, which the ancients regarded as a profanation of the sacred Names; of the Greek in that it does what in us lies to provide that none of the blessings and grace of baptism be lost through our omission, and is an act of piety towards God, desiring that whatever may have hitherto been lacking be supplied.’⁴

The late Bishop Wordsworth was of the same mind, for he wrote to Mr. Baldwin, March 4, 1874:

‘The Church has not condemned baptism administered by laymen; but I have no hesitation in saying that if I had been baptized

¹ Maskell, *Holy Baptism*, p. 220. Comp. p. 388.

² Martene, *De Rit. Ant. Ecc.*

³ Synod, 1838, can. 17; Pusey, *Tertullian*, p. 295.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 297.

by a person whose commission to baptize was doubtful, I should desire to be baptized with the hypothetical form by a duly ordained minister.'

The use of the hypothetical form avoids presumptuous dogmatism on a debatable point, which the Church has not yet decided with authority ; and it is absolutely free from any danger of the sacrilege of iterating baptism, supposing the previous ceremony was really and completely valid. At the same time, conditional baptism satisfies the obligations of the clergy, who have inherited the charge, 'Go ye, baptizing them,' and who are therefore bound not to acquiesce in the usurpation of their office by those who have received no such commission ; it satisfies the needs of the person, who thereby secures the full grace of the sacrament with a certainty which cannot be disputed ; and it is perfectly loyal to both letter and spirit of the formularies of the English Church, which, if she abstains from condemning irregular baptism, at least gives it no explicit sanction, and thus puts it upon a very different footing from regular baptism administered by the Church's ordained and lawful ministers.

ART. II.—SCEPTICAL CHRISTIANITY.

1. *Christ and Christianity.* 2. *The Story of the Four.* 3. *The Picture of Jesus.* 4. *The Picture of Paul.* 5. *The Conquering Cross.* By the Rev. H. R. HAWEIS, M.A., Incumbent of St. James's, Marylebone. (London, 1886-1887.)

THESE pretty volumes present the outward appearance of a series of novels. They are bound in the correct shade of red, traversed at the proper angle by a bar in black, and bear their titles in a mixture of Greek characters with English which may be art, but are not letters as ordinary mortals of either race have used them.

They are not novels, however. But the distinction does not lie in their dealing with facts ; multitudes of historical romances have been written with less wresting of facts than Mr. Haweis uses. The distinction seems rather to consist in this, that if Mr. Haweis had been composing a novel he would have been required to be far more definite in his presentation

of the story which he laid before his readers, and far more careful to gather up the threads of the narrative. He writes with considerable vivacity, and many a passage of imaginative interest has reconciled us to go on reading when we were almost provoked by his levity and arrogance to throw his book aside. But pretty passages do not, we know, make even a good novel if there be glaring faults of construction, and if we do not find ourselves transported into the scenes which are supposed to be presented to us. Now Mr. Haweis does not possess the intellectual industry to construct any account of any part of Christianity completely. It is no trouble to him to pass by objections and to lay down doubtful or exploded views as the only true and honest statement of the facts. He calls his volumes pictures, as if they were to set before us the personages of the New Testament, and is so desperately graphic that whenever he catches sight of anything which will make a picture, he is at it with pencil and brush, whether it is connected with his subject or not. Thus in vol. v. he gives us twenty or thirty pages of pictures from the life of Nero, *à propos* of the subject of the conquering Cross. And, indeed, as for these pictures, all we get from them is but a few flashes of colour, a kind of fireworks which illuminate the person of the exhibitor better than any other object. We are never allowed to forget the author himself nor the contempt which he affects towards his opponents in this nineteenth century. The only person of whom we obtain a definite picture is Mr. Haweis.

No one can complain that he labours to hide his own personality. Indeed some of his self-revelations are involuntary, and force upon us the doubt whether he quite possesses the qualities requisite for the task of restating the doctrines of Christianity in a better form than that in which St. Paul left them. We are not impressed by the attainments of a gentleman who can write, 'the "amare aliquid" lay in the Gnostic denying to Jesus anything but a phantom existence,'¹ or who thinks that the price at which a horse or a chariot could be exported from Egypt in Solomon's time is the 'cab and horse fare' into that country, and proves therefore how readily the descent into Egypt might be made.² A hundred and twelve pounds would have been rather dear for humble people. He also conceives that the word 'phenomenon' refers only to extraordinary or unusual facts, for he thinks it necessary to inform us that 'personally he believes in a phenomenal ele-

¹ *The Story of the Four*, 109.

² *The Picture of Jesus*, 18.

ment running through all history ;¹ and that 'no phenomena —no practices, gifts, privileges, can elude these questions ;' and that 'Paul's ministry is characteristically more saturated with the phenomenal at Ephesus than elsewhere.'² We find a specimen (among many) of his good taste as well as of his scholarship in this illustration of the Lord's injunction, 'Swear not at all':—'The adjuration, "My eye and Betty Martin," for instance, was simply the old Catholic swearing by a popular saint—"O mihi beate Martine" ("O blessed St. Martin hear me").'³ Mr. Haweis is of opinion that 'expressions such as "seeing through a glass darkly" are very suggestive (the glass being the dim horn windows of the period)'⁴—a condemned interpretation, as his favourite authority, Dean Stanley, will tell him *in loc.* He finds it recorded, apparently in his private copy of the Acts, that 'Barnabas, the son of Consolation, was chosen to fill Judas Iscariot's place.'⁵ His Roman history likewise tells him that Corinth was destroyed by 'Consul Memmius.'⁶ Perhaps we need hardly mention such peculiarities of spelling as *hailed* before the Sanhedrim, and *elogium*.⁷ But when Mr. Haweis⁸ assumes that in the larger gospels of Matthew and Luke, parables on the model, and sayings in the spirit, of Jesus' teaching may find a not inappropriate place, and quotes in illustration of this principle, 'there was in Him what theologians term a communication of idioms,' we really cannot help concluding that he believes the term *communicatio idiomatum*, by which theologians express the mutual influence of the two natures in Christ, to mean the imparting of idiomatic terms of speech by the Lord to His disciples!

Mr. Haweis is not only sometimes at variance with common knowledge, but even with himself. Thus we find ourselves⁹ informed that St. Luke, 'as a medical student, might have known Paul about A.D. 52 ; then in A.D. 94 he would be only about sixty. We cannot place the date of his Gospel much before or much after A.D. 94.' While if we proceed forward about sixty pages, 'we conjecture in A.D. 90, when the evangelist and doctor may have been about sixty-seven, he issues his Gospel, following that up in about A.D. 94 with his Acts.' It would be of no great importance were we not dealing with a writer who professes to give us such dogmatic information that St. Mark wrote his Gospel 'probably about

¹ *The Picture of Jesus*, 57.

² *The Picture of Jesus*, 90.

³ *Ibid.* 59. ⁴ *Ibid.* 121.

⁵ *The Story of the Four*, 60.

⁶ *The Picture of Paul*, 146, 147.

⁷ *The Picture of Paul*, 91.

⁸ *Ibid.* 193, 234.

⁹ *Ibid.* 71.

A.D. 70 to A.D. 74 ;¹ while, again, the earliest Gospel is 'by St. Mark, A.D. 75.'² But we are somewhat staggered when again³ we learn that about A.D. 70, Mark, the companion and amanuensis of Peter, probably at Rome, worked up some of the floating traditions which he may have had by him for twenty years or more. We read⁴ that it is of little consequence whether the Sermon on the Mount in St. Matthew is the same as that recorded in Luke vi., or only one like it. Jesus no doubt often repeated the same things; if He had not, they would never have remembered, recorded, and handed them down to us. He used repetitions, but not vain repetitions. But a few pages further on⁵ we are informed in respect of the Lord's Prayer, that 'Matthew says it was given in the midst of a crowd while Jesus was *preaching*. Luke says it was given in *solitude* to His disciples when Jesus was *praying*. The fragment stands much the same in both documents; but the setting, the editing, or the placing of it is only one more illustration of the way in which these evangelic fragments were combined and recombined; set, or, as we should say, *edited*, according to the taste or information of the special scribe, collector, or evangelist.' Why may similar phenomena be explained as examples of repetition on the Lord's part in one case, and furnish instances of editing on the evangelist's part in another?

Mr. Haweis propounds the theory of irreconcilable difference between St. Paul and the Twelve in a form more exaggerated than we suppose any writer of the Tübingen school. No assurances on the part of the parties concerned will suffice to convince him that there was no such difference.⁶ He knows better. Accordingly he represents St. Luke as smoothing matters and making Paul agree with Peter (in spite of his own Epistle to the contrary, Galatians). But by the time he comes to vol. v. he seems to have discovered in how little credit the Tübingen hypothesis stands, and he says 'that Peter and Paul had never any personal differences beyond those related in the Acts and by no means toned down in St. Paul's Epistles, we may doubt; but that their disciples had we cannot doubt.'

¹ *The Story of the Four*, 129. ² *Ibid.* 24. ³ *The Picture of Jesus*, 5.

⁴ *Ibid.* 84. The same page contains a rich specimen of Mr. Haweis' expositions:—'He opened His mouth—took care to pronounce His words so as to be heard. What a lesson to all preachers! How many of the clergy mumble the lessons and mangle the sermon!'

⁵ *Ibid.* 95.

⁶ *The Story of the Four*, 133-5, 149, 156, 167; *The Picture of Paul*, 170-2, 248; *The Conquering Cross*, 59.

These references will probably convince our readers that we have not to do with a writer whose influence on religious belief is likely to be deep. Perhaps some may even question whether we are justified in devoting further space to his work. But though we can pretend no great respect for Mr. Haweis's treatment of his subject, the subject itself is of transcendent importance. And great though his defects be, we should do very wrong to despise him. The circulation of his various works is alone sufficient to show that he must meet the wants or hit the fancy of many minds.

No doubt part of his popularity is due to the confidence with which he offers himself as a teacher who sees deeper into a millstone than the ordinary run, and flatters his readers with the notion that they must be superior persons in order to appreciate his teaching. But besides this he has the claim to popularity which results from representing in his own person and expressing with no lack of cleverness the mental condition of a multitude at this time : those, namely, who want to have the enjoyments of scepticism and Christianity at the same time. We live in a sceptical age, and our daily life is organized upon a material basis, behind which lie the great principles of natural science, with its vast pretensions and splendid triumphs, adding sanction to every claim of domination which the laws of earth assert in daily life. There is none of us who does not feel it. The most miraculous occurrence would be sceptically received by every mind of the day, and even those best prepared to accept supernatural intervention upon due proof feel themselves forced to class phenomena as natural, except upon rigorous proof that they belong to another sphere. Thus we judge of Lourdes, of Knock, of spiritualism, table-turning, and phantasms of the living. This is our habit of mind, and we have no right to be astonished that it should operate in the sphere of religion and upon the New Testament record as well as upon events which come to light to-day. Yet side by side with this naturalistic and material bent of mind there exists among us an appreciation of the moral power and spiritual value of Christianity and a yearning after its helps, such as no previous age has exceeded. The absolute freedom of the press has given to unbelievers the fullest opportunity of producing a substitute for Christianity if they can, and they have completely failed. General society takes none of their attempts at the manufacture of religion with seriousness. Christianity, so far as our public is concerned, is in sole possession of whatever moral and spiritual recommendations a credible and effective religion brings with it. And though in some eyes

these recommendations are but slight and to be the best of religions seems only to be the best of a quite useless commodity, yet such is not the feeling of the majority of society. In various degrees, but almost universally, they are persuaded that religion is a good thing, and Christianity as the best of religions comes to them with an irresistible claim. Mr. Leslie Stephen may ask, are we Christian? and return for himself the decisive answer No; but he will not find many to follow him. We quite allow that of those who refuse to follow there are a large proportion who do so merely for want of his clear-sightedness and courage. Be that as it may, the mass of men among us cling to the name of Christian.

And so we are all drawn by two systems, two influences, each of vast reach and power in its way, but of opposite character and tendency. To say that the spiritual and natural influences which bear upon us are irreconcilable in their claims would be to pronounce a sentence of despair upon human life and progress; but they are constantly in collision at some point or other. The marches are not defined by any formal treaty, and there is a constant border warfare. To multitudes, indeed, of humble Christian men and women this brings no grievous trouble. They do not live in the border land, but in the settled peaceful country. They are able both to act upon physical principles in life and to give religion its place and power without too closely examining where the claims of the one end and those of the other begin. Also it has been proved by many examples that it is possible for men who have searched as deeply and as fearlessly as any into the laws of nature to believe that they still leave room for the supernatural, and to be Christians with an ungrudging and devoted faith.

But we should naturally expect, and do in fact find, that at such a time there would be many trimmers who, either through natural tendency of mind, or education, or the influence of other people, would be drawn practically by the one influence while unwilling wholly to renounce the other. They are like the Whig statesmen of William and Mary who maintained a secret correspondence with St. Germain's, or like the Jacobite lairds who took care that their eldest sons should be Hanoverians. Which is right, Religion or Science? Who can tell? Let us then keep well with both. That this kind of backstairs friendship with one of the great contending parties, while the heart really goes to the other, is possible among the friends of religion, cannot be candidly denied. We cannot refuse to recognize the presence in the Church of a great many

persons who view the progress of human knowledge with jealousy, and accept its conclusions only because they cannot help it. Men of science often assume somewhat unfairly, and yet with a degree of plausibility, that this is the universal and necessary attitude of the Church towards their favourite pursuits. And they also are prone to suspect, and very often with good reason, that this half-hearted friendship to science deprives the acceptance which of necessity is extended to it of all real claim to the scientific temper. You avail yourself of the principles of nature, say they, merely because they are in undeniable existence, and because they bring you palpable advantages. But your spirit is unscientific at the root; science bears no real rule over it. You are always watching for an opportunity of revolt.

Such accusations are frequently well grounded. But this very fact would lead us to expect that a corresponding suspicion on the other side would equally often be justified. We should expect that there would be people whose real adherence would be given to nature and the world, for whom natural causes and operations would alone possess reality, yet who would not desire to break with religion. The advantages and blessings of religion are as manifest to them as any inventions of natural science can be. Religion pervades the society in which they move. Their parents and their wives are under its dominion, and from its influence comes all that is best in them. They know not how to bring up their children without it. They recognize the beauty of its affections and of its morality, and they could not bear to appear either to others or even to themselves devoid of that unique form of feeling and of conduct of which religion is the only known source. How to pay just sufficient honour to religion, to retain this degree of friendship with it, and yet not infringe upon their primary devotion to nature: this is their problem. Any teaching will be welcome to them which helps to its solution. There is a class of writings justly suspected by scientific men which professes to reconcile Science and Religion by treating the former from the point of view of the latter: such as *Moses and Geology*, the *Testimony of the Rocks*, and so forth. Whatever amount of truth they may contain, their principle is not good. For science should have perfect liberty, and be allowed to work out its conclusions in its own sphere. Precisely similar on the other side is the class of writings which professes to give you a religion from the natural point of view: equally bad in principle and equally sure of wide popularity. For just as the one cries out, Assemble, ye men of religion, and

learn how without departing in the least from your traditional beliefs and your chosen standpoint you may have a science containing all that is necessary, nay, a better science than your irreligious neighbours ; so cries the other, Come, ye enlightened persons who know what science is, and who stand far above traditions and creeds, and learn how to profess religion without their help—a better religion, too, than any of them can boast of, more honest, more liberal, more honouring to God and more loving to man.

We see the attractiveness of the claim, and recognize how easily it may approve itself, not only to the superficial and conceited, but even to intelligent and good people. But we believe the system to be essentially bad in its nature. As science, so also religion should be left to work out its results in its own sphere, and by its own proper power. It is a positive influence, with a well-defined circle of operation, upon conscience, mind, and soul. And this operation is completely spoiled when it works under the suspicious eye of a rival power. You cannot conduct education by the power of steam : you cannot foster religion by earthly influences.

The power of steam, it is true, connects itself with education in more than one way. In its theory it is a subject of instruction, and in its practical use it whirls the pupil to school, and carries information from one part of the world to every other. And so there are points in which natural knowledge and supernatural touch hands, and in which the conclusions of the one condition the form of the other. But the central power, the motive force, the standpoint of each is different. The independence of each must be maintained, or you lose its characteristic value. Greece taken captive by the Romans had indeed its influence still. It carried with it into their possession the stores of its glorious past, and no small amount of literary and artistic talent even in its present. But the days of original production and power passed away with its independence. The conqueror might make what he could of it—and he made no small gains ; but he could not make it yield any more of the same sample as of old, and even the legacy of the past lost most of its value when it passed into the possession of spirits so different from those which had produced it. And such is the case of religion in the hands of the natural man. Its body remains, and even that is beautiful, but its spirit is gone. He may not perceive the loss ; he may vehemently deny that anything is lost. And in the first stages of his dominion much may still remain to him which belongs properly to the previous condition.

He will still use the old phrases, and with some degree of the old spirit; but it is condemned, it is sure to perish. Only when the supernatural was a reality could it develop its true character or yield its proper fruit.

To be sure, Mr. Haweis will vigorously deny that his writings exhibit the operations of the natural man upon religion. And we should be very sorry to deny that he would be able to adduce many signs of a contrary kind. But this we believe to be the essential character of his work, and we do not intend to leave our readers without the opportunity of judging whether the description is deserved or no. Meanwhile there is no harm in saying that it is in this point of view that his volumes are interesting to us. Their learning does not claim to be extensive; their criticism does not profess to be original; their occasional beauties are excelled elsewhere. But they show us how a mind full of the influences of a material age in their most imaginative but still most earthly form fares in dealing with the first records of Christianity and the facts therein disclosed.

And first for the date of the records. Mr. Haweis places, as we have seen, the publication of St. Mark's Gospel at A.D. 70-74,¹ St. Matthew's at *circa* 85;² St. Luke's, followed by his Acts, at about 90-94.³ St. John's Gospel he regards as due to that Apostle in respect of its material; but it was not written by him, or even read to him after it had been written. It is a redaction by the hand of some individual disciple whose name is unrecorded, and was issued by the presbytery at Ephesus say about A.D. 120.⁴ We think Mr. Haweis far too late in his dates, and indeed we do not believe in the possibility of preciseness of date at all. But still his statement brings definitely before our minds the fact which Professor Westcott, without assigning an exact date, fully admits—that 'the whole [contents of the Gospels] remained a tradition for the first age,'⁵ and we prefer to dwell on the question how the undoubted distance, be it more or less, of the publication of the Gospels from the events which they record affects their trustworthiness.

Mr. Haweis remarks very truly that in those days oral tradition was valued far above written documents.⁶ With our facilities of record and publication it seems obvious that writing is the readiest means for either God or man to take in

¹ *The Story of the Four*, 25.

² *Ibid.* 71-129.

³ *Introduction to the Gospels*, 192.

⁴ *The Story of the Four*, 12.

⁵ *Ibid.* 43.

⁶ *Ibid.* 103-5.

conveying instruction or information to the world. Our minds pass without a break from the fact that a revelation has been made, to the fact that it has been written down: the one implies the other. We forget that printing, and that even writing itself, are mere episodes and occasional events in that history of the influence of mind upon mind which began when intelligence first existed on the earth. And as writing is but a particular and occasional means in God's great ordinance of living intercourse between mind and mind, so is Holy Scripture but a particular incidental expedient in that great general inspiration of Christian minds, and of the intercourse between them which is the primary institution of the Holy Ghost, and through which the Catholic Church exists. The Bible is to our present habits of mind the indispensable means of coming in contact with religion. Experience, both of the worth of writing and the defects of oral teaching, went far to justify the Protestant in setting up the Bible in place of the Church. But oral communication is the older and the more universal method ordained by God for the intercourse of man with man, and we are not to take it for granted that this law is superseded in all His dealings with our minds by the subsequent introduction of letters. Something, and that a most important thing in the transmission of religion, is lost, as well as something gained, when dependence on oral tradition is forsaken and recourse had to letters. For if oral teaching be wanting in accuracy, writing is no less imperfect in the conveyance of living influence. Even in respect of trustworthiness we must remember that it is a great mistake to compare oral tradition as it exists among a literary people, with oral tradition among people to whom writing is either not known or not the familiar method of record. It is a conceded fact that the human mind displays a power of retention when record depends entirely upon it, which it loses when conscious that writing will retain the deposit though memory should sleep. And this loss takes place in various proportions according to the various degrees in which the value for the word written may have made its way. We believe that we can notice the process at work even still, and that the modern multiplication of books in every one's house and at every one's hand has diminished the powers of the memory to retain passages from the classics and English literature as our grandfathers used to do.

Mr. Haweis does not fail to notice this well-known fact. Yet he uses it only to account for the absence of a written record at the beginning of the Church's history, and forgets it

in touching the question of the accuracy of the Gospel record when it did come to be written down. Writing does not in early times hold the value in comparison to memory which we assign to it. Quite true; but this is only the case because the memory proves itself sufficiently powerful and trustworthy for the demands made on it. And this of itself would lead us to attribute greater accuracy to the Gospel records than Mr. Haweis. He habitually treats their claims to accuracy in the freest possible manner. 'Matthew,' he thinks, 'exhibits the first growth of what we may call a Gospel Haggada, or edifying gloss literature.' 'The pupils and disciples speak and think just like the Master. Once give them a clue, a method, a specimen, one or two genuine parables beginning "The kingdom of heaven is like this or that," and from such a seed a dozen parables equally forcible will spring up; and though the Master may not have spoken them all, they are all His.' We must remark that we cannot find in any known production of any disciple of Jesus, either at that time or since, the slightest sign of power to do what Mr. Haweis absurdly treats as a simple matter, namely, to invent parables undistinguishable from the work of the Master. Nor can we find in any of them a sign of the special pleading which regards it as true to call a saying Christ's which was not His because it is the offspring of His Spirit. Pupils do paint school pictures like their master, it is true, but never like them in the highest qualities unless they be his equals in nature and power. And if you pass off a picture done by a school pupil as being the work of the master of the school on the ground that it is the offspring of his spirit, you will be held guilty of fraud in any court of law. But the point which we desire at present to notice is the gratuitous character of such a supposed origin of portions of the Gospel so long as you allow that the lapse of time before they were written is not too great to preclude their having been handed down correctly from His mouth. And it is not at all too great, as the above considerations show, even were the case one of ordinary exercise of memory on the part of individuals with assistance from their fellows upon a very interesting matter.

But this is only a very small part of the truth. For besides the ordinary inducements which men feel to preserve correctly and relate accurately matters which are interesting to them, we must recognize as one of the prominent characteristics of early Christianity the value which it attached to the sayings and doings of its Founder, and the importance which it thought to lie in knowing these correctly. St. Paul is careful

to hand on to his converts that which he also received, and exhorts Timothy to hold fast the form of sound words which he had heard of him. St. Luke writes his account of the life of Christ that Theophilus might know the certainty of those things in which he had been instructed. And if we mention the record of promises on the part of the Lord, of special assistance from Him and from the Holy Ghost in remembering and understanding what He said and did, we do so not in order to assume that the promise was performed, nor even to assume that it was made, but merely to prove the feeling of a body in which such a doctrine was prevalent as to the vital importance of a correct knowledge of all that Jesus began both to do and teach.

Lastly, it is certain that Mr. Haweis exaggerates extremely the length of time which passed before writing was resorted to for the purpose of preserving the record of the Lord's life. We do not argue with him upon the date of the Gospels, nor yet upon the general fact that it was not writing but the memories and words of living men which formed the primary organ of instruction in the Church. But these concessions can be relied on as invalidating the truth of the Gospels only on the supposition that nothing at all was written before they were written. That they are the first written documents known to us is, of course, unimportant if they embody writings which existed before them. It would be absurd to profess yourself uncertain as to the events of the reign of James II. because you know them only through Macaulay, when you know also that he compiled his history from contemporary documents. Much more is it absurd to doubt the story of four writers so much nearer than Macaulay was to the events related, including among them two actual eye-witnesses, and assisted as they were by writings previously existing. 'Still there is no written Gospel,' says Mr. Haweis of the year 63.¹ 'No trace of a written Gospel,' he repeats at the year 68.² Yet he himself afterwards tells us that there was 'a still earlier Hebrew Gospel current in Palestine ;'³ and that 'we cannot safely make up the Gospel of Matthew without reference to this Hebrew Gospel, and the Logia which passed under the name of Matthew ;'⁴ that in A.D. 57, when St. Paul writes down (1 Cor. xi. 23) the account of the institution of the Eucharist, 'the period of written tradition has arrived,' and 'we assist at the momentous meeting or coalition between the oral freshet and the written rill ;'⁵ though how he can make

¹ *The Story of the Four*, 7.² *Ibid.* 11.³ *Ibid.* 41.⁴ *Ibid.* 42.⁵ *Ibid.* 19.

it out to be the first written tradition, and not merely the first written tradition which happens to become known to us, we cannot perceive. So again he says¹ that 'both the Acts and the Gospel of St. Luke were probably coming together in the note-books of the beloved physician ever since the death of Paul (*circ.* 68), and in all likelihood some time before.' And again: 'Those four verses ("the Lord Jesus in the same night in which He was betrayed took bread," &c.) just show us what were the sort of materials out of which the Gospels came to be framed. Floating fragments of oral tradition learnt off; little written slips; bunches of sentences on parchments or "libelli" handed about with "acta" (doings) and "logia" (words) of Jesus.'² These words of Paul, he proceeds to say, were reproduced and woven into three of the Gospels; and though this origin of the Eucharistic narratives appears to us most unlikely, and we do not in the least believe it, yet the suggestion stands good to show that our Gospels may be founded to quite an unmeasured extent upon previous writings.

These considerations suffice to prove how completely unreasonable it is to talk as if the correctness of the Gospel record were left as much at the mercy of the infirmities of human memory and imagination, or the interests of doctrinal assumption, as events of the first year of Queen Victoria would be if never written down till her jubilee.

And these considerations we must beg leave to apply when we find Mr. Haweis representing St. Matthew as 'neither Jew nor Christian, insisting on separation from the law, yet clinging to the law'³—as if St. Matthew's record were his own invention; when he asks how St. John's talk about our Lord would be likely to come out when translated into the scholastic dialect of the eager young Greeks by whom he was surrounded;⁴ or when he imagines the same Apostle correcting a number of mistakes as to Jewish customs and geography made by the redactor who after the Apostle's death wrote the Gospel which passes by his name⁵ (none of them being cases in which there is any probability of mistake at all); or when he attributes to us a power to sift and condense the Gospel narrative by separating in it according to our good pleasure the transitory from the historical.⁶

But, after all, we shall be reminded, there are such differences in the Gospel records of the same events and sayings

¹ *The Story of the Four*, 128.

² *The Story of the Four*, 61.

³ *The Picture of Jesus*, 212.

⁴ *Ibid.* 97.

⁵ *Ibid.* 99. (See Canon Westcott's commentary in locc.)

⁶ *The Picture of Jesus*, 3.

that we cannot believe the memories which retained them or the process by which they were recorded to have been completely secured from error. There are, as Mr. Haweis reminds us with his usual moderation, 'various readings, discrepancies, inaccuracies, fragmentary utterances, or even contradiction to be found in the four Gospels, which not even a rabid orthodoxy can altogether reconcile or ignore.'¹ The statement is itself somewhat rabid, but in substance we accept it. We are not adherents of the theory of verbal inspiration any more than Mr. Haweis himself. It is impossible to ascribe accuracy to two varying statements of the same thing. And when this character has been clearly observed in cases where we possess a double record of the same thing, we are bound to apply it also to cases where but one narrative exists, and to acknowledge that there also we are precluded from assuming perfect accuracy. And how far the inaccuracy extends we confess ourselves unable exactly to say. But the facts of the case compel us to deny that it extends to the general character of the narratives or touches any essential point of the faith. That is what we should expect from the considerations which we have laid down as to the preservation of the record, and that is what we find when we compare narrative with narrative. The inscription on the Cross, and the words of the institution of the Eucharist, are variously recorded; but the essential meaning is the same. And there is no article of the Catholic Creed which depends on the acceptance of one sacred writer's testimony in opposition to that of another, or of the same in another passage.

For instance, we find nothing in the facts of the case to justify Mr. Haweis's treatment of the narrative of our Lord's birth. According to him the genealogies in St. Matthew and St. Luke 'record the early stage of opinion—*i.e.* the view that Christ was the Son of Joseph.' And they 'both announce the later stage of opinion as well—*i.e.* that Jesus was of divine parentage by the Holy Ghost, in which case, of course, Joseph and his genealogy become alike meaningless.'² He thinks that the doctrine of the divine parentage established itself just in proportion as Christianity became through Paul's ascendancy the religion of the (polytheistic) heathen.³

We entirely differ from him as to the relevancy of the genealogy of Joseph, upon supposition of the miraculous conception. Such an event plainly disturbs the usual course and meaning of a genealogical tree, and that under such circum-

¹ *The Picture of Jesus*, 49. (See *ibid.* 7.)

² *Ibid.* 51.

³ *The Story of the Four*, 11.

stances the genealogy of the man who was husband of the woman of whom this holy Being was born, and from whom, as was supposed, He descended, is not as relevant as the genealogy of the mother herself, is an assumption on Mr. Haweis's part from which, with great reason, the evangelists dissent. But apart from this futile and idle talk about an earlier stage of opinion being marked in the genealogies, we would beg our readers to recall what we have said and what they know from their Bibles about the apostolic Church, and say whether it seems to them to have been a body so unfixed in doctrine and so indifferent to historic truth that an 'opinion' upon such a point as the Incarnation was likely to be developed without original facts on which to found itself, and that this opinion could manufacture for itself a foundation in the life of our Lord and procure acceptance for these imaginary incidents at the hands of the Church at large. It may, indeed, seem strange to us that the miraculous birth should be related by only two of the evangelists. But for one thing, our surprise at omissions in the Gospel record is only the result of our incurable habit of assuming that the knowledge of the early Christian depended upon the written word and not upon the living voice of the Church. And, moreover, a much more astonishing thing than this omission would be the fact that the other New Testament writers, not knowing of the miracle, should not record something inconsistent with it. There is, as we all know, an intense desire to know something of the parentage and early life of great men, and if those writers of the New Testament who do not record the Lord's birth had supposed it to have been as that of other men, what could have been more natural than that some of them should have given an account of His family or of some events in His childhood or after life, or of some doctrine connected with His relations to mankind, which should have been in contradiction to the fact that He had no earthly father? This is so far from being the case that the wondrous fact forms the appropriate expression and explanation of their whole doctrine concerning His person and relations to man. For they teach with one voice a union of the divine nature with the human in the person of the Lord. Mr. Haweis lays down with the most perfect truth that 'a post-natal transfusion of God into human nature is no whit less miraculous than the pre-natal transfusion.'¹ Indeed, the post-natal transfusion would seem to us far the more wonderful of the two: for it is the union of God with a human being who has

¹ *The Picture of Jesus*, 13.

already commenced a life in unassisted humanity instead of a human life united in its first spring and commencement to God. Mr. Haweis, however, leaves us to choose between the two transfusions. But if we prefer the post-natal, what proofs, what facts, does he give us on which to build our belief in any such transfusion? None whatever. A human life begins as all human lives do; and we are to think that at some point after birth this life becomes a perfect representation (to use Mr. Haweis's meaningless phraseology) of the human side of God. What is the point at which this mighty change takes place, and what is the fact on which we can depend to mark and prove the change? There is none. When we consider the utter vagueness of belief in which, we do not say Mr. Haweis, but any one in thorough earnest about belief and its expression, would be landed by such a theory, we come to conceive the use, if we may not say the absolute necessity, of the miraculous birth to the doctrine of the Incarnation. It is a fact which brings the great doctrine before the mind and a tangible phenomenal basis on which to rest it. Instead of being an additional difficulty, it is something which, on the supposition of the transfusion of God into man, is required in order to reveal this transfusion to us. And if miraculous birth has been imagined by men in the case of the supposed incarnations of heathen religions, perhaps we see in that only the proof of a sense on the part of mankind of what is needed to enable it to receive such a doctrine.

Mr. Haweis, with very little knowledge of the use of the Greek article, reproaches the translators of St. Mark with fearing to render the anarthrous $\nu\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in the first verse of St. Mark by *a* Son, instead of *the* Son, of God. Even if he were right, the correction would have no significance when $\Sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\grave{\iota}\ \delta\ \nu\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$ stands in verse eleven of the same chapter. We, on the other hand, are convinced that although these opening words of St. Mark, and St. John's 'The Word was made flesh,' and St. Paul's 'made of a woman' be of themselves incapable of proving to us the doctrine of the miraculous birth, yet to the writers, and to the Church amidst which they were first read, they expressed the great miracle which formed part of the Church's deposit and creed.

This subject naturally leads us on to the question, How, in the view of Mr. Haweis, is God revealed in Christ? The following passages may serve to answer this question:—

'What is that necessity which changes not, even as He changes not? It is the belief in a God of love; it is a conviction that He has revealed Himself through human nature; it is the belief in a

God-communion. . . . The world's heart was grown cold and heaven silent. Christ filled both. He made men feel that in the immense unknown something there was which cared for man and palpitated for him. . . . He professed Himself as so filled with this incarnate side of God's love to usward as to stand in our presence as the God-man—the chosen and divine instrument of exhibiting to man what God was, what God meant, as far as was possible for us to lay hold effectively of Him and to conceive of His human side at all.¹

'The certainty that in the divine and human mind *σοφία* wisdom, *λόγος* divine utterance and manifestation—in other words, that goodness, truth, justice, mercy—meant the same thing in heaven as on earth, that there was a common language, a common sympathy between God the Creator and man the created, is further emphasized in the words "I and my Father are one;" "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." The absolute moral unity of divine and moral ideas is here for ever proclaimed and impersonated.'²

'Whether, with Mark, you know nothing of the miraculous conception, and simply believe the Divine Nature of Jesus to have been a spiritual influence transfusing His humanity; or whether you hold with Luke that the Divine Nature of Jesus was due to a miraculous operation at the time of conception; yet with Jewish and Gentile Christians of the first century—with Mark and Luke, with Peter and Paul—you equally hold that in Jesus and through Mary, God was "manifest in the flesh." That is the spiritual and permanent element in the doctrine of the Incarnation. You ask me to define further: I will not define. . . . You ask me to explain as far as I can what I mean by the Divinity of Christ. . . . I believe that in Jesus a special use was made of human nature for the purpose of revealing to man as much as could be revealed of God under the limitations of humanity. Whether the theory of *prenatal* transfusion by the Deity, as we are at liberty to infer from Mark and Luke, or the theory of *postnatal* transfusion of Deity to which Mark inclines, be accepted as the method of the Incarnation, seems to me a matter of comparative unimportance. The *postnatal* theory will perhaps commend itself to some as the more reverent of the two; but the same style of theology which has for centuries perceived nothing inhuman or derogatory to the Divine Being in the doctrine of everlasting punishment, has also found nothing degrading to the Deity in the *prenatal* transfusion theory. To me all spiritual inhabitation, however accomplished, is in the highest degree mystic and miraculous, and I, who believe that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, hold that the *postnatal* transfusion of Himself into human nature is no whit less miraculous than the *prenatal* transfusion, and to some, I repeat, the *postnatal* theory may seem the more reverent belief of the two. . . . One side of God, the only side intelligible to man—His humanity—that which had moral and spiritual as well as fleshly affinity with us, came forth and was *bonâ fide* expressed in the Person of Jesus. You ask me whether all God was in Jesus. I say, No; Jesus says, No.

¹ *The Story of the Four* 88, 89.

² *Ibid.* 112, 113.

Sides of the Almighty, of the Invisible, the Eternal—aspects inconceivable to man—never could be revealed through man's nature. God overlaps Jesus. "My Father," he says, "is greater than I."¹

'I call your attention to the way in which our Lord spoke of and described His own Divinity. So very different is it, I think, from the language of the Nicene or Athanasian Creeds. . . . Take Christ's words simply without preconceived definitions, and they explain themselves; nay, they need no explanation. He is in the Father: yes, as representing man before God. The Father is in Him: yes, when He reveals God to man.'²

"Christ and Him crucified," that was to be the beginning and the end; or, in other words, Paul's text was the life and death of One outwardly humiliated (crucified), yet who towered into Deity by the force of righteousness and the majesty of love! That was to be a parable for all time. There was to be found an *imperium in imperio*—the Christian Church; its life the open secret of the cross, "Victory by the life within." Yes, evermore this and only this—Jesus Christ and Him crucified.'³

'The Buddha had touched his highest spiritual level when he abolished sacrifice, and taught that remission of sin was without shedding of blood. It was a point reached in moments by the spiritual Jew also, but it was never adopted as a sound and orthodox doctrine. On the one side stood the Priests and Levites, and the ceremonial law with its bloody sacrifices by which they lived. On the other side stood the seer and singer, prophet and psalmist, David and Isaiah, before whose inspired gaze the formal sacrifices vanished away, leaving nothing but the pure Buddhist doctrine behind them. "Sacrifice and burnt offering and offering for sin hast thou not required; then said I, Lo, I come to do Thy Will, O God." It was a glimpse, like most of our inspired moments, no sooner reached than lost.'

'He who came to lift the world out of this very notion that any sacrifice but that of the heart was demanded by God, to teach men that purely spiritual conception of sacrifice, of which, first, the barbarous holocaust, and second, the blood of goats and calves, were the carnal symbols, even He has been confounded in that loving sacrifice of Himself with the vicarious victim of the carnally-minded Jewish theologian. We can now see what Paul had to contend with. We can almost sympathize with the extent to which he uses the sacrificial language of accommodation. First, there was the Substitution Theory of the carnal Jewish Christian. Secondly, there was the theory of the enlightened Gentile Christian—Paul's own; and, lastly, there is the Appropriation Theory, also grandly emphasized by St. Paul, and quite indispensable to the effective religion of Jew and Gentile alike. The Substitution Theory is absolutely false. . . . The Representation Theory is absolutely true. It was taught by Christ when He called Himself the Son of Man—"one who stands where we stand; for as

¹ *The Picture of Jesus*, II-14.

² *Ibid.* 179, 180.

³ *The Picture of Paul*, 131.

He is, so are we in this world." He has done for us in our human nature what each is bound to do. Even as He washed the disciples' feet "*for us*" as our Example, not "*instead of us*." And, lastly, there is the Appropriation Theory of Sacrifice; absolutely true. . . . His death was as representative as His life, and both can only avail us in so far as both are absorbed, appropriated by us in act or in aspiration.¹

We feel that we owe our readers an apology for occupying their time with quotations like these. It is not that Mr. Haweis is a formidable heretic. He seems incapable of understanding the responsibilities of intelligible speech, not to mention the obligations of his own position. If we were speaking to a man for whom the language of common men appeared to have a meaning, we should say to him: You refuse to define further. But you have defined further when you solemnly made your assent to the creeds of the Church; and you renew that assent every time that you repeat them before your God and His congregation. The Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, which you here contrast with the teaching of Christ, you have adopted as the utterance of your belief far more solemnly and deliberately than these random, half-considered sentences which drop from you. That theory of the pre-natal union of the divine and human in Christ which you depreciate as accepted only by those who can also adopt a belief on future punishment which you regard as utterly untrue, has been solemnly accepted by yourself. There are sects and schools of thought about you which hold the theory that you prefer; but you leave them to fight the battle of your faith alone, and class yourself among their foes when you are their friend.

¹ *Picture of Paul*, 261-66. It is hardly necessary to remind readers acquainted with Mr. McLeod Campbell's masterly book on the Atonement that Mr. Haweis's analysis of the possible views of the doctrine of sacrifice is wholly imperfect. It is possible to reject as strongly as he does the doctrine of Substitution, and yet not so to contradict all the history of religion, not to speak of the obligations of Christian belief, as to consider Buddhism, which has no sacrifice because it has no God, to be the highest expression of truth upon the point. We can believe in God's absolute power and will to forgive sins, and at the same time hold that, in order to make this forgiveness available for men, they must have that abhorrence of the evil of sin, and that strong adherence to God which shall enable Him to reverse what sin has wrought in their nature. And we can believe that the Lord Jesus furnishes for man before God what man unaided proves unable to provide for himself, namely, the hatred of sin and adherence to God, which are the essential elements of perfect repentance and make God's forgiveness available. Through union with the Son of Man sinners become partakers of this perfect repentance, which removes the impediment that bars their return to a forgiving and a loving Father. Buddhism leaves the soul without a help which it cannot dispense with so long as its feeling of sin and separation from God is more than a name.

We know what Mr. Haweis would answer to this: 'All religious reformers are obliged to act as Paul acted when he shaved his head at Cenchrea because he had a vow, or refused to eat meat offered to idols. A burden become intolerable can only be lifted by being borne patiently for a time without abatement or reserve.'¹ St. Paul, we need not say, was on these occasions doing something perfectly voluntary and entirely conscientious. But that does not hinder our perception of Mr. Haweis's intimation that he himself is bearing a burden which has become intolerable. We do not comprehend any reason why he should not shake himself free of it whenever he pleases.

If any one were to trouble himself to indict Mr. Haweis before a court for some of these utterances, we can quite well imagine his counsel pleading successfully for him that there is not one of his contradictions either of the creeds or the scriptures which is roundly stated without alternatives or verbal ambiguities, or licence given to believe if you like. But that this sort of thing should be presented to us in the name of superior truthfulness is truly grotesque. Could any mind, except that of Mr. Haweis himself, fail to notice the ambiguity of his primary statement of the nature of the revelation in the person of our Lord? In Him, it seems, the human side of God is revealed so far as we are able to grasp it, and we must not define further. Now God is revealed in His works, as speaks St. Paul: 'that which may be known of God is clearly seen, being understood by the things which are made.' Is it then as a peculiarly excellent creation of God that the Person of Christ reveals Him? For, if so, this kind of revelation furnishes no warrant for worshipping the instrument of revelation. St. Paul, a very few verses afterwards, denounces the heathen for worshipping those very creatures by which he has just said God may be known. In which of these two ways does Christ reveal God? And if we could conceive any one in genuine spiritual difficulty seeking counsel of Mr. Haweis, he would demand, but demand in vain, an answer to this primary question of the soul: Can I come in contact with Christ as a real ever-present being here and now? He says, 'Believe in God, believe also in Me. Lo, I am with you alway.' His apostles and saints and His whole Church from then till now respond by praying to Him, trusting Him, living in Him as one in whom God is revealed, not because He is God's creature, but because he is God. And when Mr. Haweis is asked whether this faith has foundation or has

¹ *The Story of the Four*, 63.

none, he answers, I refuse to define. What kind of persons can be satisfied with this species of fencing we do not know, but we are sure they will not be the persons who demand plain speaking and clear thinking either in science or life or religion.

The treatment which miracles receive from Mr. Haweis is just what we might expect. We have permission to believe in the ordinary view which Christian people hold—that we have in them examples of the exercise of the will of God not more direct nor yet more powerful than those which meet us in His constant work in the world, but to our eyes of a different outward character from the ordinary, and therefore leading us more directly to Him. ‘If you are satisfied with the divine fiat theory,’ remarks Mr. Haweis, ‘I have nothing to say.’¹ But in every particular miracle which he mentions we are furnished with a natural explanation, which we are pretty clearly invited to adopt. In the narrative of Luke iii. 3–23 ‘the student of history sees nothing unusual or necessarily unhistorical. Even the shining dove and the heavenly voice need not disturb us, since most persons gifted with common sense, following St. Jerome and Theodoret, explain that we need suppose nothing more than a light—probably a sunbeam—through a cloud, which to the spiritual eye was the holy dove, and a peal of thunder from the cloud, which to the spiritual ear was the heavenly voice.’² Therefore we clearly understand that if there had been a literally miraculous appearance, the incident would have been ‘necessarily unhistorical.’ Of the turning of the water into wine a natural explanation is suggested, this to wit, that in our Lord’s command, ‘Fill the water-pots with water,’ we have only to leave out the words *with water*, and understand that He filled them with wine, which with a loving thoughtfulness He had brought and kept outside.³ The feeble body of the palsied man may have been mesmerically restored by the ‘virtue,’ as Jesus called it—perchance magnetic emanations, which at times Jesus said He felt streaming out of Him. And so in like manner of the casting out of devils—such cases are familiar to all students of mesmerism and spiritualism.⁴ It was natural that the dear people who took Saul into their

¹ *The Picture of Jesus*, 56.

² *Ibid.* 30. What St. Jerome and Theodoret say is really something quite different, viz. that the vision of the dove was granted to St. John’s spiritual sight, like the visions of the prophets.—Meyer, *Kommentar*, vol. i. p. 106.

³ *Ibid.* 59.

⁴ *Ibid.* 67, 68.

houses should speak to him of sending for Ananias : is it wonderful that upon their doing so he should dream that Ananias came in ? It was natural, on the other hand, that Christians should speak to Ananias about Saul, and that he in turn should have his vision marking out Saul as the next person on whom he was to exercise his beneficent mesmeric, magnetic power.¹ Both Elymas and Paul were what we should call temperamentally mediumistic.² In the night of St. Paul's imprisonment at Philippi, 'one of those volcanic upheavals which during the first and second centuries visited the bed of the Mediterranean, shook the prison where Paul and Silas sang, and burst open the prison doors. In the confusion, chains, stocks, cells, furniture, prisoners, everything seems to have got mixed and shaken up. . . . Paul behaves with the exact balance and propriety of a perfect gentleman.'³ 'That principle of order, "proportion of faith," striking good sense, arrangement of "gifts" and "graces," that control over the "Prince of the Power of the Air," is just what separated Paul from those who were physically mediumistic like himself, akin to him temperamentally, but far as the Poles (*sic*) apart from him spiritually.'⁴ And so on and so on.

But the most painful example of Mr. Haweis's treatment of the miraculous is found in the Resurrection. We are told that there are ten discrepancies—irreconcilable statements—in the accounts of the Lord's reappearance, an assertion which certainly would not have been made if we had been intended to receive literally the proposition which follows, namely, that the fact of His reappearance is certain. Accordingly we speedily find the question raised—what does that certainty amount to ? The answer is, 'Why may he not have "reappeared" in accordance with some occult law of human nature, as a Son of Man, even as others are said upon evidence at least as strong to have reappeared ?'

'No one who has even a rudimentary acquaintance with the annals of the Catholic Church in the past, or with what is called psychical research in the present, can fail to have noticed that the evidence for the reappearances of some who have been passed away is logically as strong, perhaps stronger, than the evidence attainable for any of the New Testament miracles, including the reappearance of the Saviour.'⁵

We confess that we, at all events, have failed to notice it. When we take into account the number of witnesses, the

¹ *The Picture of Paul*, 46.

² *Ibid.* 73.

³ *Ibid.* 103.

⁴ *Ibid.* 145.

⁵ *The Picture of Jesus*, 264-70.

change of life and thought which they built upon the fact to which they testified, and the persecutions which they endured for their faith in it, there is no 'reappearance,' there is scarcely even any historical fact of any kind the evidence of which is as strong as that which we have for the resurrection of the Lord Jesus.

But the reader is now in a position to judge whether we were wrong in representing Mr. Haweis's book as a crude and careless attempt to teach both naturalism and supernaturalism at the same time—to satisfy himself and others that they can possess the inheritance of the Lord, and at the same time serve the gods of the heathen that are round about them. It cannot be done. You cannot eat your cake and have your cake—deny supernaturalism in every particular case, but assert it in general. That which Mr. Haweis regards as a reconciliation of religion with science and thought is really an expulsion of religion from all influence in life. It is impossible that any constraining influence in morality should proceed from a system which demands no faith and no obedience, but yields, and that with an apology, to any pressure from the earthly reason or the tendencies of human society. Mr. Haweis thinks to recommend Christianity by showing that men may take its phrases into their mouths without ever lifting their minds beyond the same natural circle within which their visible and material life is passed. But he may rely on it, the same levelling process which brings such ease of adoption, deprives religion of all its characteristic power. It is because its agencies and its methods are something more than those with which our physical nature is in contact, that it commands our consciences, comforts our souls, and uplifts our hopes, with a power which is peculiar to itself, and which the world, with whatever ornaments of sentiment you deck its materialism, can never give.

ART. III.—SHELLEY AND THE SHELLEY SOCIETY.

1. *The Life of Percy Bysshe Shelley.* By EDWARD DOWDEN, LL.D. (London, 1886.)
2. *Publications of the Shelley Society.* (London, 1886-87.)

IN the face of the large amount of interest which seems to be taken at the present time in the life and writings of the poet Shelley, we do not think it necessary to indulge in any apology to our readers for handling a subject which might at first sight seem to them a little out of place in the pages of the *Church Quarterly Review*.

We feel, too, that we have a duty to perform. No one who is acquainted with certain phases of modern literature can fail to observe that, mingled with the admiration of Shelley which is at present so common, there is a considerable amount of laxity on moral questions. Appreciation of his poetry is becoming more general, and this leads naturally to affection for his character and even sympathy with his principles. If, then, we can show that it is possible to admire his poetry without worshipping him as a deity; if we can enable our readers to form a just estimate of the strength and weakness of his character; above all, if we can convince any 'Shelleyist' of the absurdity of his position and keep him from adopting the cant and mannerisms of his sect, we shall feel we are doing some good work. We shall have to touch on the very gravest questions of morals and religion, and we shall have to show that literary taste is perfectly consistent with decency of behaviour—a statement which probably seems a truism to our readers, but would certainly be looked upon as a paradox by some persons who are probably not among our readers.

The continually increasing bulk of the literature about Shelley has recently been swollen from two sources. The foundation of the Shelley Society has led to the production of a large number of somewhat strange books, and the publication of Professor Dowden's new *Life* has provided an excuse for a large number of estimates of his character. We propose first of all to examine both these new sources of information.

The popularity of Shelley has been continually increasing, and at the present time is at its height. There is certainly no limit to either the size or the number of the editions of

his works which are published. But he is not, and cannot be, a popular poet. He enjoys many devoted adherents, many enthusiastic admirers, who lavish their money, time, and energies on his service; and perhaps it is this excessive enthusiasm which interferes with the true appreciation of his merits. Certainly, neither his own nor his worshippers' reputation for sanity is increased by the existence of the Shelley Society. We suppose we ought to feel some admiration for the genius and energy of a man who can style himself the founder of an unknown number of literary societies, in addition to being the champion of Sculls *versus* Oars, and who has published voluminous 'trial Forewords,' collecting all the information which no one wants to know. As founder of the Wycliffe Society, Dr. Furnival will have the merit of having taught the believers in 'the Morning Star of the Reformation' what very different opinions he held to what they do. The New Shakspeare and Spenser Societies at any rate publish works which are rare and difficult of access; but for the existence of the Browning and Shelley Societies it is really hard to find a reason. The former may injure the reputation of a living man, but he can take care of himself, and perhaps, with his broad interest in human nature, can tolerate the insipidities of his blue-stocking admirers. At any rate, it is a harmless society, which we venture to affirm is more than can be said of the Shelley Society whose aim seems to be to advertize to the world that Shelley wrote a great deal which was extremely foolish. Like those editors of his prose works who republish his puerile novels and rescue them from the oblivion which they deserve, by an elaborate critical apparatus which notes every variation in commas and semicolons, it feels that whatever 'bears the impress of the divine Master' must be religiously preserved and reproduced. Nothing is too small, nothing too trivial. It is without any sense of perspective. The *Essay in Vindication of Natural Diet* seems as important to it as the *Epipsychidion*, and the notes to *Queen Mab* contain the sum of his philosophy. Money is lavished on reproducing in facsimile reprint the first editions very often of his most inferior and ephemeral works, on hand-made paper (which certainly does not imitate the original), and preserving all the bad punctuation and spelling (in one case the errors of foreign printers), which we should have thought might have been dispensed with. Does not prudence, at any rate, suggest that a facsimile reprint of *Laon and Cythna* will not add to the popularity of its author? It is probable that at the end of his life he would have seen the folly of con-

stituting himself the champion of incest ; and loyalty to their eponymous hero might have suggested to his adherents that they should not publish abroad follies or crimes which demand a defence. But we really think that the very lowest depth of folly is reached when a society of educated and cultivated men announce among their publications for 1887 a facsimile reprint of the *Posthumous Fragments of Margaret Nicholson, with a Portrait of Margaret Nicholson*—poems so bad that it is uncertain whether they are meant for serious or burlesque poetry, and the portrait of an obscure maniac whose only title for distinction is that she shot at George III. and contributed a name to some of the worst of Shelley's juvenile attempts at writing verses. We think that the Shelley Society has drained the cup of silliness to the dregs. But their proudest title to fame is to have shown what a very doubtful success the *Cenci* is as a stage play, and what a very decided failure the *Hellas* can be made. They have succeeded in making the ordinary Philistine, who has at any rate the advantage of numbers, undesirous of making acquaintance with the works of a poet whose worst productions are paraded before him. After all, we do not wonder that any well-bred Englishman or decent woman shows some distaste for the poet when they see what kind of stuff his admirers are made of. Their mental calibre is what might be expected from a continued nourishment on the writings of Shelley and Swinburne and other masters of musical rhythm. Their views combine unpractical idealism with an immense superiority to all existing institutions. Their conversation rarely rises above the commonplace of literary gossip, or the repetition of the most barren freethinking formulas, but they imagine it is philosophical and intellectual. With the mind of the most ill-educated stump orator or a well-educated parrot, they imagine they are at the summit of the mental pyramid. They imitate the faults and follies of their hero, but not his virtues. They show their superiority to the world by despising its conventionalities. They ruin their health by an excessive consumption of tea and of whatever is unwholesome in vegetarian diet. If they are men, they may be known by their low turn-down collars, by their cadaverous countenance and would-be poetic aspect ; if they are women, by a style of dress which is by turns slovenly and meretricious. Luckily they are generally young, they are better than they make themselves out to be, and a few years of experience and knowledge of the world works wonderful transformations.

If we asked them to desist in the name of public opinion,

or of religion, or of decency, or of conventional morality, or common sense, it would be useless, for we should be appealing to principles which they do not recognize. But there is one appeal which they can recognize: they are genuine in their admiration of and their devotion to Shelley; one thing they feel is that his poems have not even yet attained the general popularity they deserve, and we venture to think that it is the persistency of his admirers to praise his worst qualities which causes this. What wonder if ordinary Englishmen hesitate to admire a man who is sedulously put before them as one who had the courage to follow his opinions in spite of 'faith and custom,' the joint cause of all the ills of humanity, when they hear him spoken of as a champion of something very like free-love; when they are told that he is a great philosopher, and find that his philosophy reduced all the causes of evil to the restraints of law and order; when they are asked to admire *Queen Mab*, and *Swellfoot the Tyrant*, and are shown the eight volumes of prose and poetical works half filled with writings of which even Shelley himself, when his mind was matured, was ashamed; when, above all, they find that many of the devotees at his shrine are just what they would rather not be? When they see all this they naturally feel somewhat inclined to withhold their admiration for the beauty of his poetry and of his character. The truest friends of Shelley are his most discriminating critics, and the best edition of his works would be one which contained only those poems of his which are worth reading. But enough of the Shelley Society.

We must attempt now to estimate the value of Professor Dowden's new work. The last narrator of the life of Shelley has had the advantage of succeeding to the labours of all his predecessors, and has had at his disposal a large number of unpublished documents, all the papers in the possession of the Shelley family, and a very large number in other hands: the work may in fact be considered as an authoritative Life of the poet. The author has himself spared no trouble, and neglected no source of information; he has bestowed on his book an immense—almost an excessive—amount of care. The life, not only of Shelley, but also of the various members of the circle that surrounded him, is narrated with the greatest minuteness, his money affairs are investigated with great care, and no detail is omitted of his frequent changes of residence. For our own part we should like to make a protest against the length of the book; we cannot help remembering that Johnson's *Lives of the Poets* (to take one instance) do not occupy

altogether as much space as one of the volumes before us. Plutarch's *Lives* and Catullus's poems have been light enough to float down the stream of time; we doubt whether these somewhat weighty two volumes, and the eight-volume edition containing the collected works, will not sink to the bottom, and carry something that is valuable with them. But, after all, such criticism is somewhat captious; most biographies now occupy, not two, but even three or four thick volumes, and both the controversies and calumnies which have surrounded Shelley's life make a minute investigation almost necessary. We have no doubt, too, that there are many who would complain that Professor Dowden has not given us in parallel columns the two forms of the diaries of Mary Shelley and Jane Clairmont, all the law papers which are in existence to illustrate the Chancery suit, and all the remnants of his accounts. We can even imagine some who would not be content without facsimile reproductions of all these documents. For our own part we thank Professor Dowden for the moderation he has shown, even though in some points he has been a trifle wearisome.

The first question we naturally ask is, Is this biography trustworthy? Professor Dowden has given us many new documents which help to defend Shelley's character. What of those he has not given? We must state at once that the whole work seems to us stamped with the marks of the most scrupulous truthfulness. Professor Dowden has been thoroughly conscientious in not neglecting even those letters and facts which conflict with his conclusions. As far as we are able to judge (and we have read most works bearing on Shelley's character), nothing has been concealed—so much so that in places where we do not agree with the author's conclusion (and there are several) we can generally find everything necessary to refute him in his own work. Professor Dowden has to a certain extent held a brief for a client, and had the advantage of being able to call witnesses who cannot be examined by the other side; but he does not conceal their evidence when it is unfavourable, and we can accept his facts without drawing the same deductions from them, or arriving at the same conclusions.

The literary merits of the book it is unnecessary for us to praise; we may state at once that all who are acquainted with the skill of the author will not be disappointed: they will find the criticisms generally good, if the narrative is sometimes heavy, and that the style is not inferior to that of his other works. Having said so much, we may make one or two

criticisms. In the first place, Professor Dowden feels embarrassed by the two different circles of readers he has to address. His book is addressed *ad mundum*, and he is perfectly aware that the world will not look upon Shelley with quite the same eyes as his admirers, and yet those admirers who think his character divine have to be satisfied as well, and hence there is sometimes a weakness in his apologetic remarks. His whole treatment of what he somewhat euphemistically calls the 'parting with Harriet' seems to us thoroughly unsatisfactory. He treats the Chancery suit with common sense, but feels it necessary to add that that tribunal is 'incapable of dealing with the finer tissues of human life.' Shelley's unfilial actions and language towards his father; his tendency, if not to falsehood, at any rate to misrepresentation, whether conscious or otherwise; his spirit of recklessness and revolt from legitimate authority, are all slurred over, while the beauties of his character are emphasized. There is too much tendency to ignore rather than to meet discordant elements—to exaggerate one side rather than to explain all the somewhat complex facts.

And in a similar spirit, though we never find that his bias prevents him from recording a fact or a testimony, it has very considerable influence in the weight which he gives to those facts. He accepts a second-hand statement which is favourable, and rejects a first-hand statement which is unfavourable. With regard to the purity of Shelley's life at Oxford, he believes (and rightly) Hogg's favourable testimony and rejects the unfavourable rumours given by Thornton Hunt. But why does he reject Hogg's evidence about Shelley cursing his father, and believe Thornton Hunt's story that Harriet first left her husband—a story opposed to all evidence? But, after all, in making out his case Professor Dowden has not exceeded the privileges of biographers.

And there is another fault, one which particularly besets modern Boswells, from which he is not altogether free. The refined literary taste of the present day does not approve of the grandiloquent and exaggerated encomiums which delighted our forefathers. It prefers to idealize, to throw a halo of mystery round even ordinary actions, to write in a language of refined exaltation. 'Himself lacking in mechanical ingenuity and feeling slight curiosity about the skill of the various handicrafts, Shelley, if his attention were so directed, could watch with vivid delight the marvels of the plastic hand' (vol. i. p. 85). Would our readers believe that this somewhat grandiloquent phrase expresses the skill of a tailor in mending a torn coat!

But enough of Professor Dowden. Let us once more express our gratitude for his honesty and industry, and our pleasure at his literary skill, and ask him to accept our criticisms as those of an admirer. We will now, with his assistance, attempt, first of all, to investigate the most notorious event in Shelley's life, and then to realize what manner of man he was. It may be convenient to remind our readers of the main events of his career.

Shelley was born on August 4, 1792, 'one of the greatest days,' as we are told, 'in English literature.' He lived as a boy at Field Place, in Sussex. After spending a short time at two preparatory schools, he was sent to Eton in 1804 and left in 1810. He matriculated at University College, Oxford, on April 10 in that year, and came into residence in the following October. On March 25, 1811, he was expelled for being the author of *The Necessity of Atheism*. The next three years were eventful. Towards the end of this summer (1811) he eloped with Harriet Westbrook, the daughter of a retired coffee-house keeper, and a school friend of his sisters. He was married in Edinburgh on August 28, just after he had completed his nineteenth year. He and Harriet lived a wandering life together for more than two years, changing their house almost twenty times. In 1814 he deserted her, and on July 28 of that year he left for the Continent with Mary Godwin, with whom he returned to England in September. Two years afterwards, in November 1816, Harriet committed suicide, and Shelley married Mary. After many vicissitudes, and much poverty and trouble, he finally left England in 1818, and the closing years of his life were spent in a somewhat nomadic fashion in Italy. He was drowned at sea whilst sailing from Leghorn to Spezzia in the summer of 1822.

We have now the somewhat dreary duty to perform of discussing the most questionable act of his life, his desertion of his first wife, Harriet; and before doing so we must attempt to get some idea of what Shelley was like at this period. And first let us remember he was very young. He was but a boy; but he was a boy full of energy, and enthusiasm, and wild impetuosity, attempting to play the part of a man. There is something perhaps very ludicrous, but there is something very pathetic, in his wild mission to Ireland in the spring of 1812. Can any one help being touched at the account of the visionary boy, very ignorant of the world, going over to Ireland and expecting to quiet the contending factions by

an appeal to principles of pure love and tolerance, or when addressing a Roman Catholic audience in favour of Emancipation, appealing to principles of religious equality, and expatiating on the duties of Catholics to Protestants? His manner of distributing pamphlets reads like an account of a schoolboy's prank. 'I should almost have shouted with laughter,' wrote Harriet, 'when he popped a pamphlet into a lady's poke.' But however much Harriet might laugh, her husband was very serious. He had the aims of a man and the execution of a schoolboy. Another instance of this occurred in Devonshire. He has developed a scheme which will reform the world. But how can this be spread abroad? A new idea seizes him. The pamphlets are inclosed in small bottles and securely sealed up. Then the fleet of bottles is launched forth on its voyage which is to be so full of benefits for mankind, and sonnets are written in its honour by the enthusiastic poet. Can any one help feeling the absurdity of a Government spy being employed to watch this schoolboy regenerator of mankind? And is not one's heart moved towards one whose whole soul was for the time absorbed in these strange schemes?

But Shelley's wild ideas and unrestrained actions were to have far graver results. Marriage was one of those customs which he included among the causes of evil; he was enabled by carrying out his theory to demonstrate the immense harm which might arise from its adoption. The simple fact that he deserted his first wife and united himself to Mary Godwin we well know; the details always have been involved in considerable obscurity. All the evidence on the subject Professor Dowden has collected together ably and honestly, he has thrown some light on the subject by new material he has employed. So far he has done his work well; but we must express our surprise at his treatment of the evidence he has collected. We have read and re-read the chapter, and can only wonder that he has been able to write what he has written. So many strange opinions have prevailed that we feel bound, however reluctantly, to enter into some detail on the subject.

He had married Harriet Westbrook in the summer of 1811. He had not been in love with her, we are told, but had been prompted by feelings of generosity and sympathy. She had appeared to him to be the victim of oppression, for she had imbibed some of his opinions, and the expression of them had not pleased those in authority over her. When she threw herself on his protection he married her, though she did not

demand it, and his opinions made it unnecessary to him. We are asked, therefore, to admire his generosity. Now we feel compelled to make one remark on this. If a man marries a woman whom he does not love, for her sake, intending to be her faithful husband through life, he makes a great mistake, but he is acting honourably and perhaps nobly. But if he does so believing the marriage tie to be only a form which he may ignore when it suits him, and never making any sacrifice to give his wife the first place in his affections, surely then there is little generosity in his conduct. Shelley's future conduct deprives his action towards Harriet of any merit it might have had, and the excuses given for him put it in a darker light.

For two years their married life appears to have been happy. Harriet was a faithful wife. She had much to bear. She was not recognized by his relations. She had to endure the discomforts of poverty and a roving life. She had a man of genius for a husband, to the ludicrousness of whose conduct her eyes were gradually opened. More than that, she never occupied more than the second place in his affections. For a time he addresses a certain Miss Hitchener as the 'sister of his soul'; Hogg, too, is 'the brother of his soul,' and when this brother of his soul made improper advances to his wife, he forgave him with surprising alacrity, and never seems to have imagined she might object to his presence. On the other side there was one real grievance—her sister Eliza, a woman of a commonplace and disagreeable character, who exercised over Harriet the tyranny of an elder sister and a mother-in-law. Shelley's sensitive nature must have been peculiarly exasperated by her only half-concealed vulgarity. She was not in any way blamable; she seems to have been very like an inferior lady's-maid—in fact, just what one would expect a coffee-tavern keeper's daughter to be. Shelley also complained that Harriet neglected the duties of a mother, and had had a trained nurse for her child. But so far as any reasonable complaints could be made, the balance was certainly in favour of the wife.

At the beginning of 1814 Miss Hitchener had been discovered to be a brown demon, and Eliza a black demon, and Shelley had found a new circle of friends in a society of half-French half-English ladies, who were full of sentiment and philosophy, and were surrounded by a circle of insipid and unrefined doctrinaires.

'At Bracknell,' says Peacock (we prefer his more refined satire to the coarse descriptions of Hogg), 'Shelley was surrounded by a

numerous society, all in a great measure of his own opinions in relation to religion and politics, and the larger portion of them in relation to vegetable diet. But they wore their rue with a difference. Every one of them adopting some of the articles of the faith of their general church, had each nevertheless some predominant crotchet of his or her own, which left a number of open questions for earnest and not always temperate discussion. I was sometimes irreverent enough to laugh at the fervour with which opinions utterly uncondusive to any practical result were battled for as matters of the highest importance for the well-being of mankind. Harriet Shelley was always ready to laugh with me, and we thereby both lost caste with some of the more hot-headed of the party.¹

It was but too true. Harriet was 'no philosopher,' and the fact was beginning to be discovered. She had actually laughed at the follies of the blue-stocking coterie. But if we seek for any further signs or grounds of alienation, it would be difficult to discover them—the inferences which Professor Dowden draws from certain poems are very far-fetched—and, at any rate, there could be little real alienation between him and Harriet when he went through the ceremony of re-marriage on March 24, 1814, to avoid any difficulty which might arise in case the former marriage had not been valid. This was only four months before he finally deserted his wife. On April 18 Mrs. Boinville writes to Hogg, 'Shelley is again a widower; his beauteous half went to town on Thursday.'² Such language would not have been used if there had been any alienation between them. About the end of May or beginning of June, while his wife was at Bath, Shelley was in London on business, and there he met Mary Godwin, daughter of Godwin by his first wife, Mary Wollstonecraft. He fell violently in love with her, and in spite of the entreaties of Harriet, in direct opposition to the wishes of Mary's father, he left with her for the Continent secretly on July 28. We may conclude the history of Harriet here. Shelley is, we believe, freed from the accusation of having left her without means of support; so far he acted on what he imagined were principles of honour, and he did not intend entirely to desert her. With a strange ignorance both of a woman's character and of the ordinary usages of Western society, after he had inflicted upon her what was at the very least a terrible insult, he suggested that she should come and live near them—he would have even liked her to remain in his house. When she persisted in refusing this generous offer she was called 'unreasonable,' and Shelley begins to pose as the wronged person. Two years afterwards

¹ Dowden, vol. i. p. 38

² *Ibid.* p. 410.

she committed suicide. We are informed she had degraded herself by another connexion ; if so, we really fail to see that she had done more than her husband had done first. The moral indignation of those who defend him and condemn her is certainly misplaced. We are informed that Shelley was not in any way responsible for her death. We absolutely refuse to believe this. If she did fall after he deserted her, it was entirely owing to the lessons he had taught, and to the misery and loss of self-respect that his cruel desertion had caused. When he heard of her death his remorse was acute, he began to recognize the meaning of his heartless conduct.

Stated as we have stated it, Shelley's conduct was not only immoral, it was in the highest degree selfish. We will now examine the excuses which his admirers make for his conduct. In the first place, we are told that Harriet had been unfaithful to him, or, rather, that he thought she had been. The evidence for this rests on an unsupported statement of Godwin ; on a manuscript note in her diary made by Jane Clairmont recording a statement of Mary's that she had been persuaded by Shelley to flee with him, because he said that Harriet had been unfaithful ; and lastly, a doubtful allusion made by Shelley in a letter to Southey which certainly contains some untrue statements. Professor Dowden acknowledges that the charge was absolutely groundless. We really doubt whether Shelley ever believed it himself ; he certainly only did so because he wished to do so. In any case he is equally culpable whether he invented—or rather imagined—the charge, or believed it on no evidence at all. But we are told that Harriet had herself left Shelley. The only authority for this statement is Thornton Hunt. His testimony is not accepted when he says anything detrimental to Shelley's character. The statement is quite inconsistent with the evidence both of Peacock and Hogg, and it is surely incompatible with a letter written by Harriet at the beginning of July, asking anxiously after her husband because she had not heard from him for four days. Nor, again, can we give much credit to Shelley's own statement made in the Chancery suit, 'Delicacy forbids me to say more than that we were disunited by the most incurable dissensions.' In the same paper he states that *Queen Mab* was published two years before it first appeared. It is one of the many instances in which Shelley saw facts through the distorted glass of his own feelings. Neither from his letters nor other evidence do we get any support for the statement, and we have Peacock's distinct assertion that until he met Mary Godwin there were no signs of any real discord. We

are quite willing to admit that there had been breaking of illusions on both sides, that Harriet had begun to see that Percy was sometimes ridiculous, that Percy had discovered that Harriet was without philosophy; it is true, probably, that he had never really loved Harriet, and that he fell suddenly and violently in love with Mary; but in none of these facts can any adequate excuse be found for his conduct.

We are sometimes told that Shelley did not believe in the sanctity of marriage, and that because he believed that only so long as two persons love one another they should live together, he is thereby justified. He merely carried out into practice the views which he had honestly (and perhaps rightly) arrived at. No one can resist the convictions of reason; no one can be condemned for acting according to his convictions. This is a doctrine which is becoming popular, and is certainly convenient, especially when the teaching of reason and passion harmonize. We will suggest another example. Suppose a man to be as firmly convinced that over-population is the cause of certain social evils at the present day, just as Shelley thought marriage was the cause of other evils. He would certainly have good authority for holding such views. Supposing, impelled purely by such lofty notions, he was then to kill the two orphan children of his elder brother and become the possessor of a large property; or suppose, not to take such an extreme case, he was to go down a crowded street in a poor district when the children were out of school and was to begin a wholesale murder. He would have much to say on his side, but the world would hold him to be an inhuman monster. Certainly it is very pleasant if it is sufficient to hold an immoral opinion to justify an immoral action. The fact is that Shelley had sinned, and sinned grievously; he had broken not only the code of society, but his own; he had not only stolen Mary from her father's house, he had also deserted Harriet. However leniently we may judge him, we must not hide this from ourselves. He had sinned, and the penalty he had to pay was the penance of a lifetime. He had to endure the loss of friends, the calumny and hatred of the world; he was deprived of the children whom he loved by a court whose judgment was rendered necessary by his conduct and opinions. He found himself continually exposed to misrepresentation and suspicion. His poetry found few readers, his ideals no sympathy. He had cut himself off from any possibility of influencing his contemporaries. If he had sinned in heedlessness, he paid a terrible expiation.

But if on this charge we must condemn Shelley, on others

ever
ne
Th
the
we
sca
bec
Sh
is
jec

con
wa
eag
str
tio
sub
of
yo
ob
the
lea
tha
dev
sag

In
aco
oth
dul
he
aro
tau
kne
loq
of

Sh
imp
Bu
ine
cha
all,

even worse which were made against him, and to which we need only refer, it is equally obvious that he was not guilty. There is not a particle of evidence of any value to support them. We learn very clearly how the suspicions arose. They were greedily devoured by a public which believed every scandal of the 'Satanic' school, but no good evidence has ever been brought forward in their favour, and the testimony of Shelley's own wife, of Trelawny, of Peacock, even of Byron, is enough to refute them. But let us pass to pleasanter subjects.

The most striking feature in the life of Shelley is the continued marks of progress that it shows. As a boy there was much that was attractive about him. He was full of eager passion to satisfy his mental appetite; there was much strong sympathy for suffering, and violent, if erratic, affectionateness. But at the root of all was an absolute refusal to submit to any sort of discipline, or to acknowledge any form of authority. We are told that he loved his father when quite young, but that love seems soon to have disappeared when obedience was demanded. Already at school he had gained the title of atheist, probably because of the habit he had learnt of cursing his father and the king. Oxford demanded that he should read Aristotle, so he resolutely persisted in devouring Plato. He himself says, in an often quoted passage:

'Yet nothing that my tyrants knew or taught,
I cared to learn.'

In this line of autobiography he certainly has given a truer account of his earlier life than is the habit of himself and other poets. Any one who attempted to restrain him he dubbed a tyrant, and he invariably refused to learn anything he was taught. No doubt part of his passion for science arose from the fact that it was forbidden at school, and hardly taught at Oxford. It was his boast that he had 'heaped knowledge from forbidden mines of lore,' and in this grandiloquent way he accurately illustrates one of the worst defects of his character.

The closing years of his life present us with an altered Shelley; there is much, indeed, of the old Adam there, much impetuosity, much violence of language, and want of restraint. But there is a great change. Experience, sufferings, the inevitable discipline of the world had begun to work; his character is beginning to form, his intellect to mature; above all, his poetical powers burst out with surprising richness.

Almost all that is really great in his poetry is the work of these years in Italy, and in all he wrote there is a continual work of progress, a progress as much the result of greater thoughtfulness as of greater poetic skill.

In the *Ode to the West Wind* in 1819 he writes:—

‘A heavy weight of hours has chained and bowed
One too like thee—tameless, and swift, and proud.’

And the melancholy verses in *Adonais* in which the poet describes himself are well known:—

‘Midst others of less note came one frail form,
A phantom among men, companionless
As the last cloud of an expiring storm
Whose thunder is its knell. He, as I guess,
Had gazed on Nature’s naked loveliness
Actæon-like; and now he fled astray
With feeble steps o’er the world’s wilderness,
And his own thoughts along that rugged way
Pursued like raging hounds their father and their prey.

‘A pard-like Spirit, beautiful and swift,—
A love in desolation masked—a Power
Girt round with weakness; it can scarce uplift
The weight of the superincumbent hour.
It is a dying lamp, a falling shower,
A breaking billow;—even whilst we speak
Is it not broken? On the withering flower
The killing sun smiles brightly; on a cheek
The life can burn in blood even while the heart may break.’

We only ask our readers to contrast such passages as these from the poems of later life with representations of the poet’s self taken from early works, such as *Alastor*. The poetry of the earlier period describes the conventional tragic poet in the language of immature genius. Not only is the work of the later period superior artistically, it is also more genuine. It does not deal in stagy melodramatic heroes; it is the real outpouring of a true character. Lyric poetry is always egotistic. It may often reflect only a passing feeling, but it must represent one that is genuine. Shelley’s later poems are softer in their tone, and the offspring of true self-knowledge—

‘Most wretched men
Are cradled into poetry by wrong,
They learn in suffering what they teach in song.’

And the beautiful side of Shelley’s character is that neither his sufferings nor his errors had taught him to be a cynic.

During these last years it was that Shelley's real genius began first to develop. Before his residence in Italy, *Queen Mab*, *Alastor*, and the *Revolt of Islam* were his only long poems, and though they may contain many passages of great beauty, they contain much that is unreadable. Strangely enough, too, the most beautiful of his early poems, *Mont Blanc* and the *Hymn to Intellectual Beauty*, were also inspired by foreign influences and written when abroad. Had he remained in England the uncongenial life, the continual irritation of politics, and a climate which did not harmonize with his strange habits of life would have always checked his poetical powers. Bright, sunny skies, a free open-air life, a nature with which he could continually live in sympathy, responded to and developed all his peculiar tendencies. In one of the most beautiful of his prose passages, in the Introduction to *Prometheus*, he writes :—

'This poem was chiefly written upon the mountainous ruins of the Baths of Caracalla, among the flowery glades and thickets of odoriferous blossoming trees, which are extending in ever-winding labyrinths upon its immense platforms and dizzy arches suspended in the air. The bright blue sky of Rome, and the effect of the vigorous awakening of spring in that divinest climate, and the new life with which it drenches the spirits even to intoxication were the inspiration of this drama.'

The character of Shelley is one of strange contrasts, and a thoughtful reader of his life will be continually swayed in his judgment. At one time all his admiration and love are aroused by an act of enthusiastic benevolence, and then we feel suddenly compelled to ask, Is this the same person—is this preacher of a lofty guiding rule of love the same man who deserted his wife ; or is it some maniac who is not accountable for what he does ? How is it that the poet who shuddered at the mention of anything indecent, whose poems are free from any touch of suggestiveness, could yet make himself the champion of incest, could feel attracted by the story of the Cenci, and allow his imagination to be filled with such monstrous images ? In smaller things, too, there is the same contrast. His voice was shrill and piercing, but his reading was beautiful. He would often trip up and tumble about awkwardly, but there was no one whose movements could be more graceful. Sometimes he was pleasant in society, and had all the attractiveness of sincerity and naturalness, and yet again he is shy, nervous, even harsh and disagreeable. Gentle, mild, quiet, he yet in language could rise to heights of fierce and often unjust invective. Always preaching justice and

tolerance, there are few who have formed more unjust opinions and indulged in more intolerant outbursts. So gentle that he could not injure the lowest animal, he yet never shrank from wounding the feelings of any he disagreed with. His imagination was filled with beautiful ideals of a world ruled by love and full of the influence of love only, and yet he saw in the Gospel of Love only a religion of hatred.

'Swiftly gliding in,' writes Trelawny, 'blushing like a girl, a tall, thin stripling held out both his hands; and although I could hardly believe as I looked at his flushed, feminine, and artless face that it could be the poet, I returned his warm pressure. After the ordinary greetings and courtesies he sat down and listened. I was silent from astonishment. Was it possible this mild-looking beardless boy could be the veritable monster at war with all the world?'

'He came in,' says Hogg, 'like a spirit that had just descended from the sky, like a demon risen from the ground.'

A divine emanation from heaven, says one; the head of the Satanic school, says another. But all are alike certain there was something not natural in him. Good or bad, he was hardly a denizen of this world.

It is easy for a critic to understand how either of these opinions could be held; it is difficult to strike a balance between them. That a supporter of religion and morality, knowing only certain facts of the poet's life and certain doctrines that he preached, should not be able to restrain his indignation, is natural. It is equally natural that some one, starting from different premisses, allowing himself only to see those characteristics which are, and always will be, full of moral beauty, whose imagination has been attracted by the lofty aspirations of some of his poetry, should be unable to restrain his enthusiasm and should refuse to look on the other side. But we feel that neither of these alternatives will satisfy our readers. We feel that their sincere convictions will prevent them from canonizing or deifying an assailant of Christian morality and teaching; we feel that they will not refuse to admit the Christianlike beauty of much that he did, and his genuinely lofty aspirations, and will equally refrain from abusive anathemas. It is our business to assist them in forming a clearer idea and a juster estimate of his character.

And, first, let us once more insist upon his youth. He was but thirty when he died. He was nineteen when he ran away with Harriet; he was one-and-twenty when he deserted her. He had been an author (if a bad one) for years before many men in the present day have learnt to do an examination paper, or to satisfy the army examiners in spelling. It is not

reas
boy
the
the
the
chan
man
a c
mor
or S
and
sold
we f
chan
Ever
once
men
about
almo
Jud
betw
drea
I
cann
requ
no p
with
for h
Erro
liabl
truly
was
being
hum
H
life o
of pe
of ro
her o
educ
still
bas
of ch
recip
Plato

reasonable to expect maturity of character or opinion from a boy, even though he cares for the future of Ireland more than for the success of the University Eight, and is more interested in the progress of mankind than in the winner of the Derby. For the last ten years of his life he was progressing in mind and character. He was still young when he died, and there is many a man who has attained the fame of a saint and become a champion of religion, whose early years would yield a more disastrous record. What if Cyprian had died as a heathen ; or St. Augustine while an obscure rhetorician, a Manichæan and a sensualist ; or Ignatius Loyola while still a dissolute soldier ; or Francis of Assisi as a ruffling gallant ? Not that we for one moment imagine Shelley would have ever been a champion of religion ; we only plead for leniency of judgment. Even that orthodox champion of conservatism, Southey, had once been praised by the reviews for his revolutionary sentiments ; and Wordsworth and Coleridge had had foolish dreams about improving the condition of their fellow-men. There is almost less difference between *Joan of Arc* and the *Vision of Judgment* than there is between *Queen Mab* and *Hellas*, or between the wild boy who deserted Harriet and the pale-faced dreamer in the woods of Lucca.

But if there are many men whose characters and careers cannot be judged at thirty, Shelley was essentially one who required time in which to mature. We presume that there is no poet who has not been at some time in his life at variance with the world. Excess of imagination makes it impossible for him to realize and reconcile himself to his surroundings. Errors in judgment, errors in comprehension he is constantly liable to. And probably there never was any one who more truly than Shelley 'moved about in worlds not realized.' It was the lesson of his life to learn something about human beings, and to discipline himself to the restraints necessary for humanity.

His extraordinary power of idealizing and misunderstanding life often led to ludicrous instances, especially in his treatment of persons. Miss Hitchener was a schoolmistress in Sussex, of romantic disposition and advanced opinions. Shelley met her once, talked of virtue, poetry and truth, and proceeded to educate her by correspondence out of the few prejudices she still retained. When away from her he constructed on this basis an ideal of great beauty, of brilliant intellectual powers, of charming disposition. She became his *confidante* and the recipient of letters characterized by somewhat exaggerated Platonism. Of her he dreamed while he wandered on the

Cumberland hills. She was the true sister of his soul, to whom half his property was to be left when he died. From her he asked forgiveness for the unfaithfulness he had shown in marrying: 'Blame me if thou wilt, dearest friend, for still thou art dearest to me; yet pity even this error if thou blamest me.' But after this correspondence had gone on for some time, she came and stayed with him, and the illusion was broken. If we may quote Prof. Dowden:—

'The Elizabeth Hitchener of Shelley's dream world, the Roman Portia of the correspondence, had disappeared for ever, and in her place stood a mere mortal woman—tall, lean, brown-visaged, thirty years of age, glorified by no peculiar nimbus, and having parts and passions as obnoxious to comment and criticism as those of any ordinary human creature. Her opinions, theological and political, were sadly tainted by the spirit of compromise. Her temper was variable.' (Vol. i. 311.)

We soon find Shelley writing, 'She is a woman of desperate views and dreadful passions, but of cool and undeviating revenge.' And again, 'She is an artful, superficial, ugly, hermaphroditical beast of a woman, and my astonishment at my fatuity, inconsistency, and bad taste were never so great as after living four months with her as an inmate. What would Hell be were such a woman in Heaven?' And again, 'The Brown Demon, as we will call our late tormentor, and schoolmistress, must receive her stipend.' Nor was this the only instance. To the end of his life Shelley formed Platonic attachments of the most ardent and devoted character with abstractions which had sufficient unreality to satisfy the highest form of Platonic *ἔρως*, which were the creations of his own mind, but which he called by the names of real persons. Suddenly he discovers that the material object of his affections does not possess all the virtues of the spiritual, and enthusiastic admiration changes with great rapidity into violent and unrestrained dislike. So it was with Elizabeth Hitchener; so, too, with Emilia Viviani, the goddess of the *Epipsychidion*; so, too, with Harriet; so, in a less degree, even with Mary. Of Emilia he writes:—

'The *Epipsychidion* I cannot look at; the person whom it celebrates was a cloud instead of a Juno; and poor Ixion starts from the Centaur that was the offspring of his own embrace. . . . I think one is always in love with something or other. The error—and I confess it is not easy for spirits cased in flesh and blood to avoid it—consists in seeking in a mortal image the likeness of what is perhaps eternal.' (Vol. ii. 381.)

We
bet
nov
of
She
per
esti

live
ten
tha
ver
He
was
Qu
He
bee
incu
quo
sho
men
men
his
not
diss
tine
it.
any
rest
far
he
saw
betw
coul
him
So
diss
imag
not
thing
alm
imag
were
char

We would only ask our readers to note the great change between the disillusioned Shelley of 1812 and of 1821. He now confesses his own errors, and does not blame the object of his mistaken adoration. Justice is the one quality which Shelley was unable to exercise in his judgment of other persons, and justice is the one quality least often found in the estimations which have been formed of his character.

The same imperfect realization of the world in which he lived will partly explain and may help to justify his constant tendency to misstatement of fact. Miss Clairmont tells us that he was not able to distinguish truth from falsehood. He very often certainly made statements which were not true. He told Godwin that he had written his two novels before he was seventeen. He stated before the Court of Chancery that *Queen Mab* was published two years before it ever appeared. He imagined or invented the statement that Harriet had been unfaithful to him, and that they had been parted by incurable dissensions. Many other instances have been quoted, and many of them are undoubted; they serve to show a continuous habit (from whatever cause) of misstatement. It is useless in the face of these facts to quote statements that Shelley was always truthful, or long passages in his poems of great beauty in praise of truth. After all, was it not 'grand to hear Baby Charles laying down the guilt of dissimulation, and Steenie lecturing on the turpitude of incontinence!' We must accept the contradiction and explain it. And, in the first place, Shelley is absolutely free from any touch of untruthfulness in his opinions. No idea of self-restraint would ever make him hide his views. It is only as far as regards actual facts in the world in which we live that he shows any tendency to deception. And here he never saw things as they were; he could not see the distinction between fact and fiction, between reality and unreality. He could always believe what he wished to believe, and bring himself to see facts, not as they were, but as they ought to be. So gradually he came to believe there had been incurable dissensions between himself and Harriet. So he constantly imagined events that had never happened. Dishonesty is not the fault we can accuse him of; it is the incapacity to see things as they are—a fault quite as dangerous, and perhaps almost as culpable.

The fact is, Shelley was a poet—and a poet in whom the imagination was disproportionately developed. And to this were due all the merits and all the defects alike of his character and his poetry. He was a creature, not of reason,

not of intellect, not of moral purpose, not of passion, but of feelings and of imagination. Hence often the discrepancy between his words and his actions; hence the unreality of his philosophy; hence the unjust judgments of friends, the incorrect estimates of religion. Hence, too, the power and the limitations of his genius. In judging him we must not claim for him intellectual power which he did not possess; we must not claim for him high morality, for he was without the defence and protection of a moral nature and moral principles; his real claim for praise is that his imagination though often extravagant was never depraved—though often attracted by the horrible was never attracted by the impure; it was set on high and lofty ideals; and that in following out its commands, though constantly liable to mistakes in judgment, though constantly erring through haste and impetuosity, he was capable of great self-sacrifice and was even culpably regardless of his own interests.

Shelley had all the merits of generous aspirations and feelings, but he was singularly deficient in self-control. He refused to submit to any restraints or undergo any discipline. Just as he never allowed himself to realize the conditions of life, so he never made himself conform to them. He was undisciplined in his life and his character, undisciplined in his thoughts and poetry. His mental power was great, but it was immature, for it had never been educated. He was guided entirely by his impulses; his impulses were often high and lofty, but they had never been controlled. He was eager in his pursuit after learning, but he would only learn what would please him, and in the way he liked. He was full of generosity; he was capable of great self-sacrifice. He would give up his boots to a beggar he met on the road. He would deprive himself of many comforts in order to help his friends. Godwin alone must have received from him 7,000*l.* or 8,000*l.* But his generosity often took the form of putting his name to bills he could not meet—of incurring debts which his father had to pay. In one case certainly his failure to meet a bill ruined a man. He was full of ideals about love; his feelings were genuine, but his impetuosity and want of self-restraint led to continued acts of injustice. And so in small things. He was continually making experiments in diet; often he would refuse or neglect to eat his food until he was faint with fasting; often he would devour voraciously (in order to save time) unwholesome vegetable diet. Then when outraged Nature took her revenge, he suffered acute agonies and was obliged to have recourse to laudanum. He was

never
Qu
indu
to h
It w
It w
harr
an a
duce
repu
The
acco
had
bein
the

He
bein
harr
and
betw
of lo
ther
love

We
prai
Pro
on l
hum
mak

that
inst

never an opium eater; he never contracted a habit like De Quincey, but he at times almost killed himself by a reckless indulgence. And this discipline which he refused to submit to himself he believed to be absolutely injurious to others. It was not from any immoral desires that he attacked marriage. It was because it was a restraint; it therefore checked the harmonious and natural development of mankind. It was as an attack upon what he thought an evil custom that he introduced those parts of *Laon and Cythna* which were naturally repulsive. And in harmony with this was his view of nature. The world was not to him a great ordered whole, moving according to fixed laws; he had read much science, but he had never learnt the great lesson of science. It was a divine being, and all its parts were divine. He is not using merely the language of poetry when he addresses the skylark—

‘Hail to thee, blithe spirit!
Bird thou never wert,
That from heaven, or near it,
Pourest thy full heart
In profuse strains of unpremeditated art.’

He looked upon the world as a great whole of spiritual beings bound together, not by law, but by love, and all the harmony of the universe was the result, not of a divine will and system, but of a perfect and harmonious agreement between the different portions. Nature represented the reign of love, not law; and when man has substituted love for law then universal happiness will prevail. Even the moon by love will once more feel the joys of life:

‘Green stalks burst forth, and bright flowers grow,
And living shapes upon my bosom move:
Music is in the sea and air,
Winged clouds soar here and there,
Dark with the rain new buds are dreaming of:
’Tis love, all love!’

We cannot exaggerate, and we feel ourselves unable to praise, the beauty of the panegyric on Love in the last act of *Prometheus*. But Shelley's own life was the best criticism on his philosophy; if love will make all it gazes on paradise, human nature requires the discipline of law and morality to make it fit for the reign of love.

There are two men whose lives were closely mingled with that of Shelley, and whose characters present the most instructive contrasts. William Godwin professed to be a

philosopher, and certainly succeeded in showing how contemptible philosophy could be. He had written against marriage and the aristocracy, but he was particularly careful that his daughter should be married when there was some chance of her becoming a baronet's wife. He for long refused to speak to Mary; he would not bring himself to write the name of her seducer, but he never hesitated to borrow money from him. We have seldom read anything more mean and contemptible than his letters to Shelley. The more he received from his son-in-law the more his embarrassment seems to become, and the greater his ingratitude. When at length Shelley expostulates on his extravagance he describes the letter as scurrilous, and gives continual unhappiness to his daughter by venomous attacks on her husband.

'I return your cheque,' wrote Godwin, 'because no consideration can induce me to utter a cheque drawn by you and containing my name. To what purpose make a disclosure of this kind to your banker? I hope you will send a duplicate by the post which will reach me on Saturday morning. You may make it payable to Joseph Hume or James Martin, or any other name in the whole directory' (Dowden, i. 538).

We have seldom read a more insulting or pretentious letter. Shelley always considered Godwin his master in philosophy, and certainly he exhibits the results of a philosophy based on principles of pure love in a far more pleasing light.

Again, between Byron and Shelley there were many resemblances and great contrasts. Both were men with all the impediments to becoming respectable citizens that genius so often creates; both had scandalized the world by their immoral life; both found themselves half banished from their country, and looked at with at least suspicion by all they met; both were men of brilliant powers and irregular habits; but in every other way they were extraordinarily different. Byron had enjoyed all the applause and fame of a successful poet; he had the advantage of great wealth and social position, and he had become cynical, discontented, a sneerer and a scoffer. Shelley had never known popularity, he had never received anything but abuse and contempt, and had never lost faith in his fellow-men. We picture the two in their life together in Italy: Byron, self-indulgent, ostentatious, ashamed of his intellectual powers, always anxious to be thought a man of the world, surrounding himself with a mob of retainers, prodigal and mean; Shelley, equally extravagant, but extravagant in generosity, full of in-

tellectual zeal, eager and keen about the works he read, a devoted student, a quiet gentleman. Byron's illegitimate child, Allegra, was supported for years by Shelley, and banished by her father to a convent. Her mother was treated by him with the contempt a child feels for a plaything he has got tired of, and lived chiefly upon Shelley. Shelley always announced himself an atheist, and obeyed most of the Christian precepts. Byron rather prided himself on preserving some relics of the faith, but never obeyed any of its commandments. The contrast between the two poets is the best evidence of their characters. The one pure-minded, elevated in thought, simple and unconscious, if wild, irregular, impetuous in his acts; the other sensual and degraded, always attracted by the impure, full of conscious egotism and vanity, ashamed of his powers, and playing the part of a melodramatic hero. His highest merit is perhaps that he recognized and was not ashamed to confess the moral superiority of his brother poet.

Shelley was notorious in his own day as an atheist; he was never tired of asserting that he was one. There was probably no one who less represents what is implied generally by that name. We do not wish to analyse his creed more than we have done, for a philosophical abstract of the views of a poet is of little value. But if an atheist is one who refuses to recognize spiritual principles; if he is one who looks upon the world as matter and nothing but matter; if he is one whose beliefs are bounded by his senses, and his aspirations by his desire to justify them, Shelley was certainly no atheist. We will go further: we believe that the popularity of his poems among certain persons is an unconscious protest against the atheism they profess. After looking upon the world as a dark, gloomy material process; after being told that the latest dictate of science is that man may believe in force and in matter, and nothing more, they find themselves suddenly plunged by a poet, who professes like them to be an atheist, into a world of spiritual life, where love reigns and not force, where everything is spiritual, not material, where they are taught a beauty they had never seen, and are introduced to a world they had never realized. Shelley's world is as much a figment of the imagination as the materialist's is of the senses. But the imagination has its work as well as the reason; we have heard of the dangers of its misuse: we must not neglect its proper functions; it is the ally of the spiritual power. It helps man to break through the strong bonds of sense and to see beyond the narrow horizon that bounds their

vision. And this we believe is a work which the poetry of Shelley—however inadequate his philosophy may be—can do and has done.

So much for Shelley's claims to be an atheist. His attitude towards Christianity is equally instructive. In his notes to *Queen Mab*, he informed the world, in an airy and light-hearted manner, that he had found reason to believe that the Founder of Christianity was a clever impostor. Shortly afterwards he read the Gospel narrative, and from that time forward his opinion changed, and he adopted a view which has since become part of the cant of cultivated free-thought, that the character of the Founder of Christianity was beautiful and worthy of imitation, but it was not Christianity. But his hatred was then transferred to historic Christianity. It is an interesting comment upon this fact that he absolutely refused to read history, asserting that it contained only a record of the crimes and blunders of the human race—committed, of course, all by tyrants and Christians. We sincerely ask persons who are in the habit of talking about honest convictions held by the impulse of reason, the result of careful study, and so on, whether the unorthodoxy of opinion which they defend is not very often the result of a refusal to be convinced. If a man deliberately asserts that historic Christianity has been disastrous to mankind, and absolutely refuses to take the only means of testing the question, does he not at once stand condemned of a certain guiltiness in holding the opinions which he does hold? Will not this suggest that after all a man is, at any rate to a certain extent, responsible for the opinions he holds? We will not dwell more on this, but will return to the views of Shelley. There is no doubt that they entered to a certain extent into the composition of the *Prometheus*, but it is equally certain that had the *Prometheus* been written six or eight years earlier, the colourless Jupiter, who merely represents evil religion, evil laws, evil customs, would have been replaced by a very different character. But the reading of Dante and gradual acquaintance with some of the facts of history, the contrast of Christian Europe and Mohammedan Greece, began to operate, and we find a great advance in breadth of view in the *Hellas*. In referring to the well-known Chorus of that poem, we are quite aware, as the notes inform us, that it is only dramatic; but to a lyric poet of the intensely subjective character of Shelley the capacity to grasp such a dramatic standpoint implies an immense intellectual advance. It is because we believe that this Chorus represents the very highest point to which Shelley

rose alike as a poet and a thinker that we quote what must be well known to all our readers :—

‘ A power from the unknown God,
A Promethean conqueror, came ;
Like a triumphal path he trod
The thorns of death and shame.
A mortal shape to him
Was like the vapour dim
Which the orient planet animates with light ;
Hell, Sin, and Slavery came,
Like bloodhounds mild and tame,
Nor preyed until their lord had taken flight.
The moon of Mahomet
Arose, and it shall set :
While, blazoned as in heaven's immortal moon,
The cross leads generations on.’

It has not been our purpose to criticize the poetry of Shelley ; but we venture to suggest that our view of his character is entirely supported by his writings. Let our readers compare for a short time the *Prometheus* of Æschylus and the *Prometheus* of Shelley. They will find a great deal in common ; they will find, we venture to assert, much in the more modern that equals, much even that excels, his ancient model. In power of expression, and perhaps occasionally in obscurity, it would be difficult to decide their contending merits. In power of inspiration, in magnificence of conception, in lyric beauty, the English poet is certainly not inferior. But in one point he is inferior, and that is a sense of artistic proportion. In poetry as in life, self-restraint and self-discipline are equally necessary—a fact which is certainly forgotten by a school at the present day—and the form that that must take is an adherence to the somewhat conventional rules of art. The *Prometheus* of Shelley has no real plot and no real unity ; its speeches are often wearisome by their length, and the mind is often confused by the extraordinary array of spirits that take the place of the Chorus of ocean nymphs. Full of passages of extraordinary beauty, it yet fails from being able to take its place among great poems by a complete absence of harmonious order. And so in the smaller poems. We may safely assert that the more complex the metre—that is, the more artificial restraint there is—the more beautiful they are. The most beautiful, perhaps, is the *Ode to the West Wind*. And it is written in a metre which few English poets have ever been able to master. A well-known critic has stated that it was because he was the greatest poet who has ever sung

of liberty that Shelley deserves a recognition he has not even yet attained. We believe that this criticism is based on thoroughly wrong principles, and certainly is incorrect in the present instance. It is when writing on liberty that all the poet's faults are most developed: he did not require inspiration—he required restraint, and liberty was a theme which invoked an excess of enthusiasm. The contrast of Wordsworth is instructive. The mild conservative dreamer required some external impulse to stimulate his powers, and it is just in his sonnets on liberty that he gains that stimulus. They contain his finest work, and one of the noblest literary monuments to liberty in the English language. Shelley failed just where he would most willingly have succeeded, and he failed from just that defect in his character we have noticed—a want of self-restraint.

We have attempted to delineate Shelley as we believe he really was, without exaggeration and without misrepresentation. We have attempted to point out what we believe to have been the radical defect of his character. We are far from believing he was a bad man; we certainly cannot consider him an angel or a deity. We shall consider our labours have not been in vain if we can prevent one or two unjust misconceptions, and if we can restrain one or two of his admirers from a worship which is injurious alike to themselves and the object of their adoration. One point more, and we have done. We venture to think that Shelley's life was the most complete condemnation of his theory of conduct. And to those who may be seduced by it we will put the case as strongly as we can. Here is a man who, as you hold, was a man of great moral beauty, of great benevolence, of great purity of thought, generous, high-minded, an earnest searcher after truth, and yet—you cannot deny it—he brought unhappiness on himself (no one was more unhappy than Shelley, says Trelawny) and on many others; he was guilty of constant errors, and some actions which were worse than errors; he committed acts of immorality and acts of injustice. Surely the one thing he needed was that which he most vehemently refused to submit to—an objective moral code, and an intellectual standard of truth. He read Plato eagerly, and extracted from it much that suited his theories, but never learnt the one lesson which the Greek philosopher continually impresses upon his readers—the beauty of Law and Order. To him the world is admirable just in so far as it is the embodiment of general laws, and man is admirable just in so far as his soul lives a life of harmony, and will, and restraint: the

exce
of t
are
prim
disc
by c

Res

TH
ram
The
whi
mar
Ken
rect
bey
mat
sho
seri

ver
eng
was
An
wit
min
rev
con
rati
mu
do
to
diff
to
wh

excessive wanderings of the imagination, the undue cultivation of the passions, unrestrained emotions, disordered thoughts, are all evil. Man, in obedience to his highest intellectual principles, must live a sober, well-regulated, well-ordered, well-disciplined life; his wild, impetuous, savage nature restrained by divine philosophy: νόμος βασιλεὺς ἀρχεῖ ὁ νόμος.

ART. IV.—IS RESERVATION LAWFUL?

Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the Sick and Dying not inconsistent with the Order of the Church of England.

By the Rev. T. W. KEMPE, M.A. (London, 1887.)

THIS essay is interesting, but cannot in its present very rambling form be considered as serving any practical purpose. The careful reader soon discovers that it does not prove that which it more or less strongly asserts, that its facts are in many cases confused, weak, and irrelevant, and that Mr. Kempe must be conscious that the task of proving the correctness of even the moderate statement in his title-page is beyond his power. The title-page is composed with diplomatic modesty, but the body of the pamphlet, without cause shown, is far more dogmatic, and at length ceases to be a serious argument at all.

Mr. Kempe relies much upon, and makes the most of, the very ordinary fact that men of various shades of opinion were engaged in the revision of the existing Prayer-Book. When was it otherwise, and how could it be otherwise in such a work? And he writes as if we are practically and chiefly concerned with the motives and opinions of an individual, or of a minority among the revisers, and as if we are free to sit as revisers upon them, and to call them to account, when our concern is simply with the outcome of their collective deliberations as legalized by Convocation. Mr. Kempe's mind is much confused on this point. The revisers of 1661 did not do all he would have had them do, and he impatiently refuses to believe that they did not. But they did well under great difficulties what the times permitted, and they were too wise to run the risk of failure in so serious a work as that with which Divine Providence had entrusted them. Alexander

Knox, stating the case of these revisers some eighty years ago, and generously recognizing their difficulties, said of their work: 'Without any change of features which could cause alarm, a new spirit was then breathed into our Communion Service.'

Certain differences of opinion among the revisers upon which Mr. Kempe lays so much stress are of no moment at all. They are things of the past altogether, and were of moment only until their work was finished. There must be, we know well, differences of opinion in a council or committee, as long as men are men, until a decision has been arrived at by a majority. No Roman Catholic would think of urging that the result arrived at by the two recent councils at Rome is at all weakened or affected because a minority of able men among the assembled bishops differed from and argued against the majority. The two dogmas were finally accepted by the bishops, present and absent, as a matter of course. The minority neither wrote pamphlets nor further urged their opinions to mitigate the force of the dogma, as, judging by this pamphlet, Mr. Kempe would have thought it to be their duty.

To accept both the letter and spirit of the Prayer-Book of 1661 with a frank loyalty, and without any such special pleading as Mr. Kempe uses, seems to us to be of the first importance, and a duty which requires no proving. Our force and usefulness as a Church depends upon our doing so. The Church of England has spoken by this book, and if we cannot submit our private views and inclinations to it, the end must inevitably be that we shall be 'made a very strife unto our neighbours, and our enemies will laugh us to scorn.'

We propose to treat this essay on the terms of its title-page—terms which are still more definitely expressed in the course of the argument. Mr. Kempe has narrowed the question of Reservation to one of consistency with the Prayer-Book; and, having raised so important a question as that, we shall not feel bound to travel beyond his lines. Holding his view to be untrue and unproven, we wish he had rather employed his ingenuity in showing cause for the restoration of Reservation, and in discovering some of the reasons for its omission by the revisers. We can well imagine some of them, and they are worthy of investigation. To do this would have been helpful, interesting, and to the point, and we think it would have better satisfied his own conscience. For in spite of very strained explanations and of laborious references to men and periods which have no connexion with the case, he

is y
into
the
of
say
finc
hea
dist
wis

clai
Boo
exp
biti
may
but

care

by r
the b
resp
and
Cath
sick
Bod

that
form
and
vati
and
of q
own
obey
ask
we s
thro
the
of d
gene
and
mak
to b
it is

is yet so clearly conscious of failure to bring the Prayer-Book into agreement with his wishes that he is driven to suggest the cutting a knot which he is quite unable to untie. Instead of that 'calm and judicial temper' with which, as he truly says, an inquiry of this kind should always be conducted, we find the spirit of a very keen advocate. He weights himself heavily and fatally by discussing as one subject two entirely distinct questions, to the serious prejudice of that which he wishes to promote—the practice of Reservation.

Mr. Kempe has not the mind of a born general. He claims allies which are not to be depended on. The Prayer-Book is certainly not his ally, as we shall show from his own expressions, in which there is a great and too dazzling exhibition of useless learning. This, used in Mr. Kempe's manner, may be impressive to hasty, superficial, and prejudiced readers, but he cannot conceal that it is unsatisfactory to himself.

At p. 5 he writes, for instance, in words which should be carefully noted :

'The needs of the sick and dying cannot be adequately supplied by *rigidly insisting upon* (what is assumed to be) the *literal* force of the *later formularies* of the Church of England, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that the *spirit* of the Church is most *dutifully* and *intelligently* observed by following the continuous stream of Catholic tradition in making provision for the communion of the sick and dying by *reserving* the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.'

Such a suggestion put into plain English must mean that as the existing Prayer-Book (described as 'the later formularies') *does not* (although the pamphlet in its title-page and elsewhere says that it *does*) favour the practice of Reservation, but has deliberately left out certain previous rubrics, and has made arrangements for the communion of the sick of quite another sort, it is therefore advisable to take one's own course, exercise one's own will and judgment, and disobey the Church's voice in her Prayer-Book. But, if so, we ask with some surprise, of what use is the ingenuity which we shall find that Mr. Kempe has exercised so abundantly throughout his essay to prove that the Prayer-Book allows the Reservation of the Sacrament? Such a recommendation of disobedience is only consistent with the view that his general argument is a failure, that his title-page is in error, and that Mr. Kempe holds some power of dispensation. To make confusion by thus overleaping boundaries seems to us to be inconsistent with all faith in Providence. The wrong of it is not reduced by grandiloquent language, nor, as a salve to

conscience, by hazy and unsustained assertions of a certain sort of Prayer-Book authority for Reservation in which Mr. Kempe certainly shows but a very small faith. Before Churchmen can accept advice so unprincipled the salt must have lost its savour, and the faith which should acknowledge the hand of God in things which have been lawfully arranged must be becoming extinct. In a day like this, when lawlessness is disintegrating all relationships and disturbing all duties, it is a serious thing for Churchmen to surround it with a halo and treat it as a lawful remedy.

Mr. Kempe makes a statement at p. 154 of which, as of some others, we cannot suppose that he sees the force. 'The question of Reservation for the sick,' he says, 'was *distinctly* present to the minds of the revisers in 1661.' And he adds, 'It was *not then* judged advisable to restore the rubrics which explicitly directed the practice of Reservation in the book of 1549.' As they had never been in the book of 1661, we do not see how it was possible to restore them to it. The word is an inaccurate one, and seems to be used to give an impression in favour of Mr. Kempe's view. We trust it was used accidentally. We will read 'insert' for 'restore.' But, read it as we may, it is an abandonment by Mr. Kempe of his view that Reservation is 'not inconsistent with the order of the Church of England.' He endeavours to mitigate this statement by adding that this was done 'without one word of censure respecting the traditional usage of reserving the Holy Sacrament.' We are unable to see how the deliberate omission by the revisers, of rubrics, to direct something which he says 'was distinctly present to their minds,' can be reduced in its importance by saying that it was done 'without one word of censure.'

We are unable to reconcile another statement of Mr. Kempe's with the foregoing. He says at p. 31, 'Since, *so far as we know*, the question of forbidding Reservation was not so much as raised at the last revision of the Book of Common Prayer in 1661, *we cannot resist* the conclusion that it continues to be perfectly legitimate.' Mr. Kempe seems to have small powers of resistance to that of which he is enamoured. We have to reconcile the statement that 'the question of Reservation for the sick was *distinctly* present to the minds of the revisers in 1661' with another statement, that 'the question of Reservation was not so much as raised,' the latter statement being weakly qualified with '*so far as we know*,' which means anything or nothing.

Mr. Kempe evidently does not claim any special know-

led
tin
tho
wh
pro
tem
fait
and
him
con
Re
ma
rub
any
to
Co
sist
som
Be
tho
Pra
fou
we
are
hav
mer
the
suc
way
essa
goi

the
he
tho
inc
at
cau
hun
con
see
con
can
from
that
v

ledge as to the singular and unnatural fact that something distinctly in the minds of the Revisers was not debated by them, though he yet founds upon it a conclusion in his own favour, which he says 'we cannot resist.' 'Out of the same mouth proceeds blessing and cursing.' The 'calm and judicial temper' is with difficulty discerned in all this. Mr. Kempe's faith in his contention that Reservation is consistent with, and is recognized in, the Prayer-Book, seems quite to fail him at p. 17, where he plaintively submits to the generous consideration of the bishops the desirability of sanctioning Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament. This petition he makes immediately after admitting the 'omission' of any rubric in the Prayer-Book directing Reservation, but without any sense of how impossible it would be for such a permission to be given in the face of all the rubrics which refer to Holy Communion both in public and private. Mr. Kempe's inconsistencies and contradictions and irrelevancies are a wearisome feature in the essay. He introduces the Venerable Bede, the Middle Ages, and all known traditions, without a thought that we are concerned with a comparatively modern Prayer-Book in which he asserts that his view is to be found. The pamphlet consists of 186 pages, but by the time we have reached p. 20, in spite of much to the contrary, we are startled by a paragraph which says, 'Thus we claim to have established this point, that the Reservation of the Sacrament for the Sick is in no wise inconsistent with the rule of the Church of England.' We were not prepared at all for such a very early flourish of trumpets, but it is Mr. Kempe's way. We become aware of his triumphs too entirely, as the essay proceeds, from his own mouth. The italics in the foregoing quotations are our own.

It is the more unjustifiable in Mr. Kempe to explain away the Prayer-Book by help of any former Prayer-Books because he has conceded that the changes made in 1661 were made thoughtfully and deliberately. Many of his expressions are inconsistent with such a concession, as, for instance, his remark at p. 1, that 'this venerable usage has, from a variety of causes, fallen into disuse in England during the last three hundred years.' We are compelled to become accustomed to contradictory statements. We are yet, however, at a loss to see how a custom which, as he allows, has been deliberately considered by the Church, and has been omitted by authority, can with accuracy be spoken of as having 'fallen into disuse from a variety of causes.' It is surely better to admit manfully that it has been omitted, that it lacks authority, and can only

be restored by authority, and that not of the bishops, to whom Mr. Kempe appeals, but of the Church. The Church had the wisdom to see what was possible in regard of divine worship at the time of the last revision of the Prayer-Book, and to do it, and she committed the result in trust to us, who have been grossly negligent of it. Men fought and suffered in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to save things which Mr. Kempe and others unwisely assert to have been saved. It is truer to acknowledge that there was grave loss and grave changes in the ways of the Church of England, and that our treatment of the Prayer-Book with which we are entrusted has not been and is not such as to entitle us to look for any immediate recovery of our losses. We gain nothing by special pleading and misrepresentation. The subject is above the level of all that sort of thing. We have inherited a system in which many features are lacking, which we trust will be restored; but it is a system which will produce very abundant results if honestly, devoutly, and dutifully accepted and consistently worked, as it has never yet been worked and used by us. On the faithful using of the talent which has been committed to us it depends, no doubt, whether more shall be added. We have lost much and have deserved to lose it, through our defects of love, faith, and reverence. One only question is of pressing importance. Are we prepared, at this eleventh hour, to use steadily and fully all that we have inherited in our present Prayer-Book?

How do we treat, for instance, those prayers, Matins and Evensong, which should be the daily training of the clergy and people for the higher services which we are endeavouring to restore to their rightful place and importance? Have they not unaccountably fallen into disuse, although the rubric which demands them is one of two to which the Church has given extreme prominence? Her words in it are, 'The order for morning and evening prayer daily to be said and used throughout the year.' It immediately precedes the 'Ornaments Rubric,' which is nowadays so much and so justly pleaded. Is it necessary for one of these two important rubrics to drive out the other? May they not co-exist? In a Churchman's mind do they not naturally co-exist? Must daily prayer be discouraged and generally omitted because we realize Holy Communion to have been unworthily treated and scantily honoured in the past? How small and weak we are! We give a recent fact. A clergyman spending a night in London went a few months since to a well-known church on the east side of Regent Street to attend Morning Prayer,

which
a cele
priest
a quar
who is
Servic
Matins
notice
Thus
other.
welfar
'Orna
former
Book
rubric
with m
Prayer
think v
of the
Holy C
spiritu
we bel
to the
self-ple
to their
is the
the fac
building
we can
Mr. Ke
interest
of Res
are. T
work.
the hel
We hav
the aut
and ad
for our
which,
the Pra
sect?

It is
great v
Mr. Ke

which is advertized on the notice-board for 8.30. He found a celebration of Holy Communion proceeding, at which the priest *alone* communicated. He waited at its conclusion for a quarter of an hour, and then ventured to ask a clergyman who issued from the vestry when the stated Morning Prayer Service would begin. His reply was, 'There will be no Matins this morning.' 'Oh, yes,' he added, 'I know the notice-board announces it, but they seldom say the service.' Thus we construct with one hand and pull down with the other. We expect respect and sympathy and prayers for our welfare when we go to prison for the sake of the latter, or 'Ornaments Rubric,' while we set at nought and ignore the former explicit rubric for daily prayer, to which the Prayer-Book gives an exact and equal prominence. This former rubric is, in fact, in the stronger position of the two; for it is with more definiteness again expressed in the Preface to the Prayer-Book 'Concerning the Service of the Church.' Do we think we honour the higher means of grace by omitting the use of the lower? Do we not rather run the risk of coming to Holy Communion with hearts largely unprepared for discerning spiritually the Lord's Body? Such and many more risks are, we believe, run by those persons who make light of obedience to the Church's instructions, and live an easy religious life of self-pleasing, with good intentions but small faith. Obedience to their own inclinations, rather than obedience to the Church, is the modern ordinary habit of our clergy and people. In the face of such general neglect of the Prayer-Book, of such building from above rather than below, as we see around us, we cannot yet awhile feel seriously interested in the effort Mr. Kempe is making. With the means he uses we feel no interest or sympathy; for they are not true. This question of Reservation is not at present to the front. Many others are. There is much which must come first, if we mean solid work. The question must be pressed, when we reach it, with the help of truer facts than those which Mr. Kempe uses. We have first to recover respect for authority in general, and the authority of the Prayer-Book in particular. By omission and addition and transposition are we not framing a Church for ourselves—a human rather than a divine institution, which, as it is perpetually at variance with the authority of the Prayer-Book, must at length descend to the level of a sect?

It is very difficult to convey to our readers an idea of the great versatility and, if we may call it so, the buoyancy of Mr. Kempe. When he does not find rubrics to his mind he

assumes, as at p. 156, that they are not necessary, 'and that in this respect there is a remarkable agreement between our present form and the venerable monuments of antiquity.' This is scarcely the way in which an unprejudiced mind, which knows of all the special rubrics with which our public and private Communion Offices are laden, could express itself. But then such rubrics make unfortunately *against* Reservation. It is, however, much the same to Mr. Kempe whether proofs exist or are absent. He closes or opens his eye in a way which would be amusing if the subject were one of less gravity. If he finds the Prayer-Book unsuitable for his purpose he discourses upon Bishop Sparrow's *Rationale* and other personal opinions, as we shall presently notice. His principle is one of private judgment, or each priest his own Prayer-Book. A celebration of Communion in the sick man's room (p. 15) he treats as dependent upon the opinion of the individual priest as to the fitness of the said room. He so appears to read the words of the rubric in the Communion of the Sick, 'having a convenient place in the sick man's house with all things necessary so prepared that the curate may reverently minister,' as if there were to be no communion unless, *in his opinion*, the place was 'convenient.' 'Convenient' is a relative term. The curate is entrusted with the duty of *making* a 'convenient place' to the best of his power. Such a place can always be made where there is simple reverence without exaggeration on the part of the sick man and the curate. If the curate had the option of celebrating or not celebrating in the sick man's room we fear that in Mr. Kempe's case a 'convenient place' would be generally absent. The will and the way keep close company in most things. The rubric, of course, means that the best is to be done that can be done. Where is it hinted, much less said, as Mr. Kempe puts it at p. 15, that without certain things 'the priest is not authorized by this order for the communion of the sick in celebrating the divine mysteries?' The rubric says nothing of the kind. Mr. Kempe names 'sacred vessels of precious metal' as if they were one of the essentials. It is useless to enlarge on such exaggeration as this, which we sincerely trust is an oversight.

In spite of the vast changes of the Reformation period, which ended in a breach with Rome, in spite of the reconsideration of every conceivable detail in the services and of successive revisions of the Prayer-Book, Mr. Kempe quotes, as still having full authority, pre-Reformation documents such as Archbishop Peccham's *Constitutions* of 1281, and the acts

of Bi
for R
Book
that t
of th
in op
sure,
Praye
much
with
upon
then
and p
E
Ratio
able a
At p.
for th
from
imme
in 166
Kemp
rate v
Mr. K
refer
help o
the P
ject.
our pr
times
the va
each n
p. 158
intend
to sup
tained
to be o
this C
gains
private
'comm
said to
obedie
Again
'agree

of Bishop Tunstal. He asks at p. 63, in respect of an order for Reservation by Bishop Tunstal, as if the Revised Prayer-Book of 1662 were governed by it, 'How comes it to pass that this order for the reverent care of the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood has been persistently set aside in open disobedience to the law?' Mr. Kempe can, we are sure, answer his own question. It is simply because the Prayer-Book has no reference to such an order, and says very much which is adverse to it. We are not concerned nowadays with more than the mere fact of its abandonment. He leans upon the staff of this bruised reed of a previous practice, and then exclaims indignantly, as we have seen, when it goes into and pierces his hand.

Equally singular is his use of Bishop Sparrow, whose *Rationale* he delights in quoting as if it were an unquestionable authority, and not a mere private expression of opinion. At p. 14 he says, 'The bishop quotes at length the rubrics for the Communion of the Sick with the reserved sacrament from the first Liturgy of King Edward VI. ;' and Mr. Kempe immediately adds, 'It is true that the rubric was *amended* in 1661.' Should not '*amended*' be written '*omitted*'? Mr. Kempe has elsewhere said '*omitted*,' which is the more accurate way of expressing it, but not so suitable, perhaps, for Mr. Kempe's general purpose. We see no object in such a reference to Bishop Sparrow. At p. 155 he endeavours, by help of Bishop Sparrow, to connect our 'present order' with the Prayer-Book of 1549, to the great confusion of the subject. He relies on a private opinion of Bishop Sparrow that our present order 'seems to refer us to former directions in times past.' The word '*seems*' should be noted, as well as the vast field which the sentence opens for the exercise of each man's private judgment; and Mr. Kempe proceeds at p. 158 to refer to Bishop Sparrow as follows: 'If it had been intended to prohibit Reservation for the sick, is it reasonable to suppose that one of the revisers could have publicly maintained that in his opinion the practice of Reservation was still to be commended as being agreeable to the ancient usages of this Church and realm?' We do not see what Mr. Kempe gains by this quotation. He quotes in it only the bishop's private opinion that the practice of Reservation is still to be '*commended*.' To help Mr. Kempe the bishop should have said to be *practised*. Many who would shrink from the disobedience of practising it could and would commend it. Again he relies on the bishop's support from the words 'agreeable to the ancient usage of this Church.' Well, no

one doubts *that*. But for Mr. Kempe's purpose the bishop should have been able to say 'agreeable to' the Prayer-Book set forth by authority. Mr. Kempe is of opinion that other bishops should have remonstrated against the reissue of Sparrow's *Rationale* (a private book) in 1663; and that, as they did not remonstrate, Reservation could not really have been forbidden. Very seriously weak must a case be which relies on such singular arguments. We hear a great deal more of his private opinions than we believe that Bishop Sparrow could have approved, he being merely *one* of the revisers.

Mr. Kempe relies much on Bishop Gibson of the last century. He mentions him first at p. 6 as holding that Archbishop Peccham's *Constitutions of Canterbury*, which enjoin Reservation, 'are to this day embodied in the ecclesiastical laws of the English Church.' But having used him so far, he allows at p. 71 that Bishop Gibson is defective upon the matter of Reservation, and he says, 'With regard to the legal aspect of the question, it must in fairness be admitted that this constitution is regarded as obsolete by Bishop Gibson.' He cannot, however, consent to lose the private opinion of so distinguished a person, and he tells us that the bishop must really only mean that 'it has, in consequence of a combination of circumstances, become disused.' At p. 81 he returns to Bishop Gibson, and so quotes him as to seem again to claim him as an authority for the practice.

In connexion at this point with the above he takes it that reviving Reservation, which he cannot prove to be mentioned in the Prayer-Book, stands on the same footing as reviving the Ornaments Rubric, which *is* very distinctly and prominently mentioned in the Prayer-Book. The 'calm and judicial temper' again fails him. He relies again much on the Latin Prayer-Book of 1560, while he yet acknowledges at p. 171 that it is 'technically without ecclesiastical authorization.' As it gives him support, however, he is charitably lenient, and sets himself to account for such a 'defect;' of which defect, however, he seems at p. 179 to be forgetful. For he there says that Bright and Medd's *Liber Precum Publicarum* of 1865 lacks the *imprimatur* of authority and of synodical recognition which belongs to the *Liber Precum* of 1560.

We have followed Mr. Kempe, at the risk of being wearisome, in the maze through which he leads us, in hopes of finding that he can somehow extricate us handsomely. But he does nothing of the sort. He is jubilant, however, with a few exceptions, throughout. Expressions such as 'Thus we

claim
reason
'Her
with
serio
biass

I
the s
tions
an ec
that
trusi
he m
men
requ
Pray
he h
Pray
'in

form
Cath
close
is aw
been
disco
'Ind
tradi
were
certa
Pray
have
edify
in p
optio
been

F
to be
tion,
Engl
and

I
revis
whet
occu
inter

claim to have established this point,' at p. 20; 'It is but reasonable to conclude,' at p. 22; 'Thus it is evident,' at p. 45; 'Hence it is manifest,' and 'Throws a flood of light,' at p. 92; with many such others, must not, however, be taken too seriously. They mean that Mr. Kempe's unjudicial and strongly biased mind is endeavouring to be satisfied.

He produces in addition what he perhaps considers as the strongest and crowning proof that the Prayer-Book sanctions the Reservation of the Eucharist. It consistently crowns an edifice built up of private judgment. He tells us at p. 100 that the practice of Reservation is at the present time 'unobtrusively but widely practised,' and with characteristic modesty he makes suggestions as to the mode of conveying the Sacrament to the sick. What better proof than such as this *can* we require of the consistency of Reservation with the Church's Prayer-Book? What better keystone to such an edifice as he has constructed? How can it be inconsistent with the Prayer-Book if Mr. Kempe practises it? He states that 'in the previous generation, as he has been credibly informed, the Eucharist was carried from the altar of Durham Cathedral for the communion of sick persons in the cathedral close.' And then, *more suo*, he adds in a note, 'The author is aware that the accuracy of this statement, which has already been made public, has been questioned.' Nothing, however, discouraged, but rather waxing bold, Mr. Kempe continues, 'Indeed, it is said that the practice of Reservation has been traditional at Durham.' Such hearsay evidence, even if it were proven, is beside the mark. It would only establish that certain persons have lawlessly exceeded the directions of the Prayer-Book, as we know that another class of Churchmen have, with equal lawlessness, come short of them. How edifying a book might be written on Mr. Kempe's principle in proof of the Athanasian Creed and daily prayers being optional or not required of Churchmen because they have been so largely and disloyally omitted!

By such means Mr. Kempe builds up what appears to us to be a house of cards; and he adds, with childlike satisfaction, 'Such, therefore, is the canonical rule of the Church of England set forth in the *Constitution* of Archbishop Peccham, and still standing unrepealed.'

In watching Mr. Kempe's wanderings among the several revisions of the Prayer-Book, we are almost disposed to doubt whether he thinks that the revisers of 1660 were seriously occupied, or merely met for their own amusement with the intention of leaving each of us to re-revise for himself the

Prayer-Book, which has yet been passed down to us by lawful authority. Indulgence in such a spirit as that in which Mr. Kempe revels must seem, we think, to men of 'calm and judicial temper' to be a revolutionary exercise of private judgment and a declaration of war against order and authority. It recalls the dialogue between Eve and the Serpent in the Garden of Eden, the earliest exercise of private judgment, and a fatal one.

A law may be amended by proper authority; but while it exists it must be obeyed. Nothing is gained by shutting one's eyes to its existence, or by impatience or special pleading. Everything is gained by patience and obedient acquiescence in lawful authority. Wonderful words are spoken of patience and obedience for those who have ears to hear. But this hasty, restless century of religionists either disdains them or turns a deaf ear to them.

Reservation of the Eucharist for the Sick is an undeniably ancient practice of the Church, and therefore in itself to be respected. No one needs to be told this. But whether Mr. Kempe likes the fact or not, it has been withdrawn from us. And we had better rather try and understand so far as we can why it has been withdrawn than deny the fact of its withdrawal or struggle against what seems to be providential. There are difficulties connected with the restoration of Reservation of the Eucharist for the Sick which persons of Mr. Kempe's lighthearted temperament neither hint at nor consider. They are great in theory and very weak in judgment. They rush into a thing the moment they see its advantages, regardless of consequences or of lack of authority. But reverence moves more slowly. This is not an age of faith, and faith and reverence must have much to say about such a restoration, many considerations must be weighed and a lawful decision come to. An individual may not break bounds at pleasure.

Mr. Kempe revels in the indulgence of what to many of us seems a habit of exaggeration. He indulges it with small restraint. In the very beginning of his essay he gives us a picture of the present religious state of the Church of England which is more than highly coloured. Does he realize the meaning of his own words, that the 'great work of religious revival has wellnigh transformed the face of the Church in this land,' followed by an outburst of gratitude which must have an unreal and painful sound to most of us whose experience is of closed churches and a mutilated Prayer-Book? These realities are the facts which must be gravely weighed.

Very s
assum
a tradi
that it
divine
tion, a
to gras
blind
is som
the E
man's
mome
than in
awkwa
would
childli
Metho
their v
faith,
this in
in all
secula
seen a
has le
parent
tions,
the H
ing.
preach
parent
abdica
under
genera
reach
H
things
the po
or dev
munic
open
open a
How
servic
in the
and a

Very serious is the question which he handles so lightly. He assumes the preparedness of our people, and the existence of a traditional faith which is not in them, much as one wishes that it were. We are dealing with men as they are, and with divine mysteries, with a generation of small powers of imagination, and of unsacramental ideas, whose strength is more equal to grasping things seen than things unseen. It is of no use to blind oneself to this. To supplement such feeble faith there is something helpful in the sight of the visible consecration of the Eucharist, as ordered by the Prayer-Book, in the sick man's room. It requires no explanation, and at such a moment there may well be no distracting explanation other than in the Church's own words. We can all see some of the awkwardnesses and inconveniences from which Reservation would save us if our religion was of a more spiritual and childlike kind. But while the Church slept, Puritanism and Methodism, and dissent of every conceivable kind have done their work in alienating our people from the simplicity of the faith, and we cannot move for their benefit without taking all this into account in a practical manner. The habits of people in all ranks are being increasingly fashioned upon merely secular principles to the destruction of religious faith. Things seen are those in which this generation really believes. It has less and less any habits inherited from the days when parents trained their children in religious practices and traditions, and impressed them with a knowledge of and faith in the Holy Scriptures. The foundations of faith are disappearing. It cannot be preached into people, as in this age of preaching we often assume that it can be. Faith in the parent generates faith in the child. But parents have largely abdicated, and hence the gravity of the present period. And under a public system of merely secular education, the next generation unaided by parents must in the nature of things reach a lower depth.

How does the Church meet the case of such a state of things? Can we say that the Church of England is providing the people with any steady daily opportunities for exercising or developing faith in God, for cultivating the faculty of communion in prayer with God? How few of our churches are open in the week, and how still more rare it is to find them open at hours convenient for the people who most need them! How many of the clergy, by scarcely attending such week-day services as exist, except in their own turn for duty, encourage in the laity the belief that prayer and praise are a weariness and a drudgery, rather than an intercourse with God!

But, spite of such distractions and speculations as men like Mr. Kempe provide for us, the case of our people (for whose ills and heathenism another method of communicating the sick will be no remedy) cannot be a hopeless one, while it is yet a most serious one. In the presence of such a case we may not question and explain away, as Mr. Kempe must be held to do, any kind of real authority, and least of all the Church's manner in the Prayer-Book. We must put aside all questioning of our lawful weapons or we must fail. We must honestly go to work with what we have, rather than with what we have not. For the work is a religious one, and must be true throughout. Attempts to begin where we should end are worse than a waste of time. Ingenuity and diplomacy in such matters have no promise of a blessing.

Dark and late in the day, however, though the present hour may be, we can yet endeavour if we have the mind so to redeem the time as to be able to render a not altogether unworthy account of the talents which this Church of England has received in trust from her Lord, and may have hopes that those further talents for which we work and pray may be added.

We cannot at all acknowledge, as having yet taken place, the religious transformations of which Mr. Kempe writes. We cannot see our way to follow him in the jubilant strain which he adopts about it. There will, perhaps, ever be those sanguine and superficial temperaments which are disposed to exclaim, 'We are rich and increased with goods.' But coupled with such language there is the warning voice which whispers, 'Thou knowest not that thou art blind.'

ART. V.—J. A. DE THOU.

1. *Thuanus, Jac. Aug. Historiarum sui Temporis Libri xxxviii, ab anno 1543 ad annum 1607. Accedunt ejusdem de Vitâ suâ Commentariorum Libri sex et Nic. Rigaltii Contin.* Seven vols. folio. (Lond. 1733.)
2. *Life of Thuanus, with some Account of his Writings.* By the Rev. J. COLLINSON. 8vo. (London, 1807.)
3. *Mémoires de la Vie de Jacques Auguste de Thou.* (Amsterdam, 1714.)

THE earlier part of the seventeenth century was confessedly the most learned period of modern European history. The

Scalig
Blond
in the
one s
books
Conti
Seld
litera
found
learn
learn
of bo
attra
They
tions
Class
writ
fami
religi
may
assur
of the
by the
Frenc
not o
public
histor
throu
in his
his to
been
he wa
eager
with
wrong
gener
of this
it is c
it eag
specia
day g

these f
this er
abunda

Scaligers, the Casaubons, Heinsius, Grotius, Sarpi, Bellarmine, Blondel, were all of them giants in varied erudition—scholars in the truest sense of the word—not men of one book or of one subject, but endowed with an encyclopædic knowledge of books and things. Nor were the English far behind the great Continental scholars. Camden, Usher, Andrewes, Bacon, Selden, Savile, Wootton may rank in the same high class of literary attainment; ¹ while King James, if not himself profound and exact, had learning enough, and enough love for learning, to appreciate and encourage learned men. The learning possessed by these men was essentially a knowledge of books. Natural science, then almost unborn, did not attract them to the paths of experiment and investigation. They read and stored up all the abstruse and varied speculations that human brains had evolved before their time. Classical writers, Christian fathers, mediæval schoolmen, the writers on both sides in the Reformation controversy, were all familiar to them, and the result in many of them, as far as religion went, was a sort of eclectic latitudinarianism, such as may be seen at its best in Grotius and Isaac Casaubon. But assuredly no proof could be supplied of the learned character of the period in question stronger than that which is furnished by the conception, completion, and general estimation of the French history of James Augustus de Thou. That age was not one devoted merely to literary trifles, in which a leading public man could conceive the idea of writing in Latin the history of his own times, could execute the enormous task through fourteen years of unremitting labour, and give forth in his lifetime, or leave behind him to the public, the result of his toil in seven huge folio volumes. The writer must have been animated in his stupendous work by the conviction that he was not labouring for an unappreciative public, and the eagerness with which his book was expected, the heartiness with which it was welcomed, clearly proved that he had not wrongly judged. It is scarcely probable that any man of this generation has read from beginning to end the huge volumes of this history, which is the longest history ever written; but it is certain that many of De Thou's contemporaries devoured it eagerly, and criticized it in detail, and that, with some special exceptions, the general opinion of the learned of his day gave an emphatic approval of its candour, accuracy, and

¹ 'A prodigious reach of learning distinguishes the theologians of these fifty years, far greater than even in the sixteenth century. And in this erudition the Protestant Churches were, upon the whole, more abundant than that of Rome.'—Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, ii. 354.

truthfulness, as well as of the graces of its style and the deep insight of the writer. Our object in this paper is rather to bring before the reader the man than his writings, to exhibit the character and opinions of this trusted servant of kings, in a time when religious wars and bitter fanaticism were more fierce and savage than perhaps at any other period, and to show how a good Catholic, a profound thinker, a man of stainless life, could repudiate the extravagant bigotry and the gross corruption of the Romish Court, while he remained perfectly faithful to the doctrines accepted by his Church, and was without suspicion of heresy. De Thou is thus, like George Cassander and Paul Sarpi,¹ a witness from within against the abuses which have been allowed to grow up in the Church, and that extravagant spirit of domination and persecution which have wrought such bitter mischief to Christianity.

James Augustus De Thou (or Thuanus, as he preferred to call himself) was born at Paris, October 9, 1553. His father was *Président à mortier*—that is, one of the presiding judges in the Parliament of Paris, which was essentially a legal body—and in this office his son afterwards succeeded him. The younger De Thou was a very delicate child, and his life seemed to hang by a thread; but he exhibited a great capacity for learning, which was carefully cultivated. When in Dauphiny, under the tutorship of the famous lawyer Cujacius, at the age of seventeen, he formed a friendship with Joseph Scaliger, which he cherished throughout his life. This friendship, on account of the freedom of Scaliger's religious views, was often made the ground of an accusation against De Thou. In reply to such accusations De Thou writes in his memoirs:

'He² can solemnly affirm that he never heard this great man dispute on the controverted points of religion; and he is well assured that he never did discuss them but upon provocation, and then unwillingly. What! independently of religious opinions, were there not in Scaliger the most transcendent attainments of human erudition, from which those who associated with him might justly hope to profit? and did not the singular endowments bestowed upon him by Heaven claim the veneration and esteem of all worthy men? Alas! Religion, which formerly rested on the pillars of faith, hope, and charity, is now thought to need the aid of faction and the intrigues of human subtlety. Hence God's indignation is abroad.

¹ See *Church Quarterly* for April and October 1886.

² De Thou wrote memoirs of himself in the third person. These are printed in the seventh volume of Buckley's edition, and have been frequently reprinted separately.

He b
feared
to dev
of Cl
nant
mode

A to
At th
father
Day.
atroc
of C
Ther
the y
of th
of th

'J
Jérôn
they
to be
tende
innoc
him o
fear
mass
see h
a hig
dragg
had
not b
seen
the a
so m
was
Coun
to an
profu
diti
proje
what

T
gion
eccle
Nich

He has suffered us to be blinded by our passions ; and it is to be feared that corruption, spreading like a gangrene, may be permitted to devour His primitive establishment ; and that while the Kingdom of Christ is sought in one place and another, only a scanty remnant may escape to serve Him in the spirit of unity, truth, and moderation.¹

A terrible illustration of this text was now to be given. At the age of eighteen De Thou was recalled to Paris by his father, and was a witness of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. Who will ever be able to read the history of that atrocious slaughter, the most terrible chapter in the history of Christianity, without feelings of the profoundest horror? There is abundant evidence that it sank deep into the soul of the young man, who, going out to attend mass on the morning of that fearful Sunday, was constrained to be an eye-witness of the dreadful evidences of the slaughter.

'He could not,' he says, 'see without horror the bodies of Jérôme de Grosloot, Bailli of Orleans, and of Calixte Garrault, which they were dragging to the river by the nearest road. He was obliged to behold these fearful objects without shedding a tear—he, whose tender nature would not allow him to behold the death of an innocent animal without emotion. The suffering which this caused him obliged him afterwards to remain closely within his house, from fear of meeting again with such sights. When the fury of these massacres was a little slackened, he went, some days afterwards, to see his second brother near the Gate of Montmartre. He lived on a high spot commanding a view of Montfaucon. The people had dragged thither that which remained of the body of the Admiral, and had fastened it to a wooden gibbet with an iron chain. He could not but call to mind the nobleman whom, a few days before, he had seen in the Church of Notre Dame, conspicuous enough to attract the attention of all. He recalled to memory this captain, famous by so many victories, by the capture of so many cities—the man who was just on the eve of obtaining a glorious triumph in the Low Countries—and now his body, after a thousand indignities, fastened to an infamous gibbet! These reflections caused him to admire the profundity of the judgments of God, and the feebleness of our condition here, the narrow limits of which ought to arrest the vain projects of our vast designs, and keep us ever fixed in the thought of what one day must infallibly befall us.'²

The horror of these outrages, done under pretence of religion, did not, however, hinder De Thou from entering the ecclesiastical profession. He went to reside with his uncle, Nicholas, Bishop of Chartres, and being admitted into minor

¹ J. A. Thuani de Vita Sud Comm. Buckley, vol. vii. Append. iv. p. 8.

² Ibid. p. 11.

orders, obtained a canonry in the cathedral there, which he held for fourteen years, residing in the house of his uncle. During this time he was assiduous at his studies, and especially devoted himself to laying the foundation of that splendid library which he afterwards perfected. During this period, also, he had the opportunity of seeing Italy under most favourable circumstances, having been attached to the suite of Paul de Foix, who went as ambassador to the Pope and the Italian princes from Charles IX. He visited all the great Italian cities with the ambassador, who was a man devoted to learning, and examined in his company all the treasures of ancient and modern art. At Mantua the Italians, who perhaps did not estimate French taste over highly, played somewhat of a trick upon the ambassador and his companions. They lauded the beauties of a marble Cupid by Michael Angelo, and the Frenchmen, after inspecting the figure, declared that it surpassed all that had been said of it, and was absolute perfection. Then, after allowing some time for their praises and admiration, the exhibitors drew off the coverings from another figure, and revealed another Cupid—a work of the ancient world—the marble of which was no longer white, but the execution so wonderful, the effect so life-like, that the whole party were covered with shame at the admiration which had been lavished on the statue first seen, which by the side of the other seemed a block of marble without expression. They were told for their consolation that this had been precisely the judgment of its sculptor, Michael Angelo. At Rome a too candid Cardinal explained to the ambassador and to De Thou some of the mysteries of that corrupt Court; showed them how suits were deliberately prolonged with an utter contempt for justice, and how foreign suitors were invariably made to suffer. He pointed out to them how perfectly true was the saying of Machiavelli that the Papal Court was supported by those acts which prove ruinous to other empires. De Thou procured many valuable books in Italy, and on his return to France devoted himself to study. After he had been for some years thus employed, an event occurred which ultimately changed the whole current of his life. His elder brother died, and his father was much pressed to obtain for his second son a dispensation from his ecclesiastical vows, that he might marry and continue the family. The old judge hesitated about taking this step, but in a short time he himself died. The son then succeeded to his father's office, though he had had no training as a lawyer beyond his own desultory reading. It was perhaps thought that family aptitude would suffice, as

the off-
father,
Act re
from g
age.
by whi
minor
and da
steered
king, v
had be
quaint
teries
describ
work,
has to
truthfu
says :—

‘Th
failings
nondas
They w
in intim
with va
establis
with ot
gated t
and as
side.
at his r
to com
ledge o
flattery
except
commi

Th
compr
was pu
the na
edition
twenty
the H
relatin

the office of President had been held by his father, grandfather, and uncle. However, it was held advisable to pass an Act restraining De Thou, who was then thirty-four years old, from giving judgment as President until he was forty years of age. A suit was now instituted in the Ecclesiastical Court, by which De Thou was absolved from the obligation of his minor orders and allowed to marry. Throughout the troublous and dangerous times of the Wars of the League, De Thou steered his way with prudence, being loyally devoted to the king, with whom he was high in favour. No man could have had better opportunities for making himself thoroughly acquainted with all the secret machinations and hidden mysteries of those complicated events, which he afterwards described in so much detail. His qualifications for the great work, which he commenced at the age of forty, he himself has told us, if, perhaps, with somewhat of vanity, yet with truthfulness. Speaking of himself in the third person, he says :—

‘Those who know him well know that, however numerous his failings, he was always superior to falsehood ; and that, like Epaminondas, he never allowed himself to utter an untruth even in jest. They well know that from the twentieth year of his age he has lived in intimacy with men of the first repute ; that he has been entrusted with various important concerns, and is so to this day, with the same established character for probity and virtue. Let him be compared with other writers, and it will be found that he has continually mitigated the animosity of contending interests by temperate language, and as a judge in law questions ever leaned to the least invidious side. Besides the daily prayers which every Christian ought to offer at his rising, he made one applicable to his work, and never sat down to composition without begging God to enlighten him with a knowledge of the truth, and enable him to follow its dictates without flattery or detraction. This, indeed, he trusts he has accomplished except where his judgment may be deficient, and he confidently commits his work to the unbiassed sentence of posterity.’¹

The History was begun in 1593, and the first portion of it, comprising eighteen books, together with the famous Preface, was published in 1604. This portion of the History contained the narration of events from 1546 to 1560. In a second edition it was divided into twenty-six books ; and in 1606, twenty-three additional books were published, bringing down the History to 1572. Additions appeared in 1607 and 1609, relating the events to 1584. This was all that was pub-

¹ *J. A. Thuani de Vita Sua Comm.* Buckley, vol. vii. Appendix iv. p. 128.

lished in the author's lifetime, though it was only about half of what he had written. The first complete edition was not printed till some years after his death, and to an English scholar, Thomas Carte, the historian, belongs the credit of having, after enormous labour, brought out, with the aid of Mr. Buckley, his London editor, the most perfect edition of this great work, printed in London in 1733.¹ How was it that the publication of De Thou's History, admired as it was by all his contemporaries who were capable of judging, was suddenly checked, in the reign of a king who professed the most liberal sentiments in religious matters, and who had always pretended the greatest regard for the historian, and employed him in the most confidential affairs? This attempt to stifle the voice of history, and to do violence to the thoughts and minds of men, testifies to the extraordinary influence and to the pitiless policy of the Court of Rome. In his History, De Thou had ventured to relate things as they really occurred. He had not shrunk from telling the truth about the infamous profligate who ruled the Christian world under the title of Alexander VI. He had described in fitting colours the brigand life and manners of Pope Julius II. He had narrated with the fidelity of a true historian the worldly policy of Pope Leo and his sale of Indulgences. These were sufficient offences to draw forth the anger of Rome. But there were others also which perhaps touched her more acutely. Rome had deliberately encouraged the policy of assassination and murder in dealing with the Reforming movement in France. Henry III., who had contended against the Ultramontane League, had been struck down by the dagger of Jacques Clement, and the Pope extolled in full consistory the act of the assassin. De Thou had ventured to characterize this utterance of a Christian pastor as one 'of an arrogance and want of moderation highly unbecoming his pastoral character.'² When the 30,000 victims fell on that fearful St. Bartholomew's Day there was rejoicing at Rome. The butchery was celebrated in paintings, and medals were struck in its honour. De Thou had not hesitated to describe it in its real colours, and in his verses addressed to Posterity he reiterates his condemnation of it as a 'horrible carnage, the eternal dishonour of our nation—a day of terror, which gave birth to a spirit of madness, which caused blood to flow without remorse and without

¹ Collinson: *Life of Thuanus*, pp. 279-294. An Act of Parliament was obtained by Mr. Buckley to protect his work from foreign reprints for fourteen years.

² *Ibid.* p. 355.

horn
wh
agai
(a J
on r
cher

dete
religi
the C
His
nation
pallad
Sinon
of oth
a vas
at the
wrung
no ot
of sca
out a
a par
which

This
ment
Cassa
Liben

' p
sword
which
but is
of the
no inf
religio

horror.'¹ But even more than the History itself, the Preface which introduced it had excited feelings of most furious anger against the author. De Thou's friend and executor, Du Puy (a Jesuit, but superior to the traditions of his Order), has left on record his views on the cause of the bitter hostility cherished at Rome against De Thou:—

'On mature reflection, I believe the cause of offence to be the detestation he always expressed of war entered into on account of religion, and the advice he gives for restoring primitive discipline in the Church, and for convoking General Councils at stated times. His enemies are particularly stung by what is said concerning the national laws, "the prerogatives, privileges, liberties, and, lastly, the palladium of the realm." For, in a word, they are a company of Sinons, who watch opportunities of enriching themselves by the ruin of others; of invading the liberties of oppressed kingdoms; of making a vast parade of exorbitant power by trampling on the crown, even at the hazard of the destruction of the Church. They are vexed and wrung to the heart at the exposure of their wiles. Hence, and from no other cause, arise those animosities, calumnies, and that torrent of scandal. Hence, an unlimited censure was passed at Rome, without any cause assigned, on the entire history of Thuanus when only a part had been published; published, indeed, with that Preface which galls them to the quick.'²

This famous Preface is in fact an elaborate historical argument in favour of toleration, and may be classed with George Cassander's *Via ad pacem ecclesiasticam*, and Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Prophesying*.

'Experience has taught us,' writes De Thou, 'that fire and sword, exile and proscription, rather irritate than heal the distemper which has its seat in the mind. Religion is not subject to command, but is infused into well-prepared minds from a preconceived opinion of the truth, with the concurrence of divine grace. Tortures have no influence over her—affliction and pain have no power over the religious man. His happiness is in his own bosom, and whatever

¹ 'Postremo mihi crimen atrox et morte pium
Objicitur, verbis quod sum insectatus amaris
Urbe Parisiaca lanienam mane patratam,
In Constantini quæ nunc et visitur aula,
Præcipuos inter Romæ depicta triumphos.
Laudem ego tantorum quod apud nos causa malorum
Exstitit, et porro sæclis erit usque futuris?
Quod cunctas gentes inter populosque propinquos,
Gallorum infami deturpat crimine nomen;
Implevit trepidas quod seditionibus urbes
Libertatem odiis dedit immanique cruoris
Per cædes populos fundendi accendit amore?
Non execrer ego potius?'

² Collinson, p. 82.

assails him outwardly is trivial, and only grazes the surface of the body. Tortures by no means repress the ardour of innovation in religion; but their minds are rather hardened by them to suffer and attempt more. France has now witnessed this irritation for forty years, and the Netherlands nearly as long. Mild persuasion and amicable conference may still conciliate those whom force cannot subdue.¹

De Thou then enters into an examination of the opinions of the Fathers on this point. St. Augustine, he points out, had written to Boniface that, when the public tranquillity is endangered, it is proper to relax from severe discipline and to invoke the healing influence of charity.

'St. Martin and St. Ambrose refused to communicate with those bishops who had incited the emperor to use capital punishment against heretics. Such punishment was almost unknown in the Church till the time of the Vaudois. In England, John Wycliffe was allowed to go to his grave in peace. The Emperor Ferdinand, a wise prince, was in favour of toleration, and employed George Cassander to draw up a *modus vivendi*. Coming to his own time, it was permitted to him to say, under the reign of his Majesty (Henry IV.), that war is not the legitimate mode of removing schism from the Church.'

De Thou then gives a sketch of the religious wars of France, and the misery brought about by them. He then pays a well-deserved tribute to the peace-loving rule of Henry IV. and to the happy settlement made by the Edict of Nantes:

'Taught,' he says, 'by experience and your Majesty's example, I have abstained from opprobrious language, and have always made honourable mention of the Protestants, especially those who excelled in learning. Neither have I concealed the faults of our own party; for I think, as the best men have thought, that the manifold heresies which agitate the world at this day have gathered strength not more from the malice and intrigues of their supporters than from our vices.'

He then advocates reforms in the Church—promotion strictly according to merit—the rebuke and abating of covetousness. He then turns to an elegant panegyric of the life and character of Henry IV. and ends with a devout prayer for the prosperity and happiness of France.

Such was the Preface which gave such deadly offence at Rome. How was it, and the History which it introduced, received and treated by the famous sovereign to whom it was addressed in all confidence, as it appears, of a kind welcome? The record of this is a somewhat humiliating one, and does

not ex
At the
and o
quickl
the bo
May 4
the Po
the Pr
and th
Thou v
he pro
courtie
pleasu
year, I
dor at
'I belie
that he
done a
to appl
republic
he says
discour

The
not ma
his wor
willing
he in
History
contin
execut
the ins
by the
employ
Thou p
kindly
Jeannin

'The
enemies
death of

¹ Th
² Ibi
³ As
De Thou
three bo
⁴ Col

not exhibit the popular king in the most creditable light. At the first reading of the Preface, the king was much pleased and ordered it to be translated into French,¹ but then there quickly came a change. The Pope's nuncio complained of the book, which was held at Rome to be offensive, and on May 4, 1604, the king writes to his ambassador there: 'When the Pope's nuncio spoke to me in terms of complaint against the President's book, I let him know my disapprobation of it and that I had stopped its sale, which has been done.'² De Thou was no doubt greatly vexed at this opposition, which he probably least of all expected, but he was too good a courtier and too loyal a servant of the king to allow his displeasure to be seen openly. At the beginning of the next year, De Villeroi, the king's minister, writes to the ambassador at Rome:

'I believe the President repents of having published his History, and that he would not proceed to such lengths if the thing were to be done again.³ We must contrive, with as little noise as possible, to apply some remedy; and there is no other but to prevent its republication. I have spoken to him, by His Majesty's desire, and he says he will be the first to bury it in oblivion, and prevent further discourse on the subject.'⁴

The great weakness of the character of Henry IV. should not make us forget the enormous practical value to France of his work and reign, and it is certain that De Thou would not willingly offend one whom he prized so highly. But that he in reality changed his views, or desired to suppress his History, there is no proof whatever. On the contrary, he continued to the last to labour at it, and left directions to his executor to complete the publication. The publication of the instalment put out in 1604 was, as he tells us, hastened by the knowledge that a German amanuensis, whom he had employed, was about to publish a garbled edition; but De Thou probably never doubted for a moment that it would be kindly received by the king. He writes to the President Jeannin:

'The king was at first my protector, but the subtlety of my enemies more than their open slander induced him to waver. The death of some of my friends and the coolness and inactivity of others

¹ *Thuani Opera*, ed. Buckley, vol. vii. Appendix ii. p. 2.

² *Ibid.*

³ As a matter of fact, the greater part of the History published in De Thou's lifetime was published after the date of this letter. Twenty-three books were published the next year, 1606.

⁴ Collinson, p. 182.

left me without support. I confess I was indignant, and said that if even Spain had been my native country I should have received there the honour denied to me in France.¹

It may easily be supposed that if even the king, whose instincts were in favour of toleration, and who had loved and trusted De Thou, was overborne by the influence of Rome, and brought to discourage and repudiate him, the literary militia of Rome would not be backward in their attacks. Of these two—Scioppius, a hireling scholar, and Machaud, a Jesuit—were conspicuous for their virulence. De Thou did not care to answer them, but, supported by the general approval of those whose opinions were really valuable, went tranquilly on his way. In the concluding volume of the edition of his works, collected by Thomas Carte and edited by Buckley, there is brought together a great mass of letters from various notable persons, all uniting in praise of his great work. De Thou had sent a copy of the first part, immediately on its publication, to King James of England. He had not stinted to use the accustomed tone of flattery, always too apparent in offering such gifts to princes :

‘The report of your Majesty’s virtues, like the effulgence of the rising sun,² your sincere friendship with our King, the bond of agreement now so closely drawn between the two nations of France and Great Britain, the eminent regard you have shown to men of letters and to literature itself, and your character for general courtesy, all these causes have conspired to facilitate my access to your Majesty, and have made me indulge the hope that you would graciously and favourably accept this production of my industry such as it may be, and you will find examples of salutary precepts which you have consigned to all posterity in a book that deserves to be written in letters of gold [*Basilicon Doron*]. I pray Almighty God to preserve the most Christian King to his people, and your Majesty to your subjects, and both for the general benefit of Christendom. And as He has lately inclined your mind to cultivate by all good offices and friendly services a closer bond of mutual amity, so may He dispose the hearts and turn the attentions of both by joint consent to restore concord to the Church, lest in ratifying articles of peace ye may seem to have been more intent on strengthening your respective territories than in exalting the glory of the Supreme Lord of us all.’³

King James condescended to reply to the historian in a letter written in French. He says :—

¹ Buckley, vol. vii. Appendix ii. p. 7.

² We are forcibly reminded here of the dedication of the Authorized Version.

³ Collinson, p. 129.

‘
which
take i
heart
in the
ences.
be, no
occasi
so lau
spirit
and w
by the

Never
De T
Scotla
king,
he wa
Bucha
while
inquir
spirit.
affair
and o
Conse
was m
written
Isaac

‘H
misled
bounds
and sci
mother
with ce
of men
possible

King
Robert
was ex
narrati
stantia

No
than at
Papal p
Paul S

'You manifest the respect and good-will you bear to our person, which we receive and acknowledge with a return of affection, and take in good part the exhortation, which in the sincerity of an honest heart you make, on the subject of using our efforts to forward union in the Church by an elucidation and adjustment of religious differences. To this measure we assure you that we are, and always shall be, not only well disposed but earnest in promoting it, and on all occasions every exertion which depends on us shall be employed for so laudable an object. We have never, we thank God, entertained a spirit of sectarianism, nor disregarded the general good of Christendom, and we cannot but wish that all princes and potentates were actuated by the same inclinations and desires as ourselves.'¹

Nevertheless King James was not altogether satisfied with De Thou's history as it proceeded. In relating the affairs of Scotland, in the second part, De Thou, fearful of offending the king, had sought the advice of the learned Camden as to how he was to treat the events of the year 1566. He had followed Buchanan in his severe strictures on the king's mother, and while the work was passing through the press he anxiously inquired of Camden whether Buchanan had written in a fair spirit. The learned Englishman gave him his version of the affair (the courtly one), but De Thou was too fair an historian and of too candid a mind to be altogether influenced by it. Consequently he treats Mary rather severely. King James was much vexed at such unaccustomed freedom. In a letter written from England after he had become domiciled there, Isaac Casaubon tells De Thou :

'His Majesty sees, not without impatience, that you have been misled by a certain party, and have been transported beyond the bounds of truth, in repeating in your letters and relating with a diligent and scrupulous minuteness reports to the prejudice of his blessed mother of glorious memory. These his Majesty knows, and knows with certainty, to be false, and to have been the fabrications of a set of men rebels to her power, and who exerted themselves by every possible means in harassing and bringing destruction on her head.'²

King James (Casaubon tells De Thou) had directed Sir Robert Cotton to write a true account of these events. This was executed and transmitted to De Thou ; but, though the narrative was somewhat softened in a second edition, yet substantially the same account of Queen Mary remains.

Nowhere was De Thou's history received more favourably than at Venice, then in the midst of her struggle against the Papal power. There is abundant record in the letters of Father Paul Sarpi of the value which he put upon it, but no letter of

¹ Collinson, p. 135.

² *Ibid.* p. 154.

his to De Thou has been discovered. Another Venetian correspondent characterizes the work as 'excellent and immortal,' and freely acknowledges the corruptions of the Roman Church, which it holds up to view, but qualifies this by saying 'nevertheless it is still the Catholic Church.' It may be confidently affirmed that this was always the opinion of De Thou. He was, of course, freely accused of being a Protestant, or of favouring Protestant opinions, but there does not appear to be any ground for this assertion. He was, of course, a strong Gallican. He opposed the acceptance of the decrees of the Council of Trent, which France had refused for forty years. He advocated strongly the national rights of the Church of France, but that he had any difficulty in accepting any part of the doctrinal teaching of the Church of which he was a member does not appear. He is described in his epitaph as *Christianæ pietatis antiquæ retentissimus*, and this he may well have been without believing in the infallibility of the Pope, or doubting that a good Protestant could be saved. In a letter to Cardinal Sforza, written in 1606, De Thou eloquently defends his work and the position which he had taken up :

'When I undertook to write the history of this time, although I knew well that complaisance conciliates friends, and truth gives birth to hatred, I yet did not expect to meet with judgments so little equitable, and readers so prejudiced. The civil strifes excited in the past century on account of religion are a thorny subject, and, like ashes, with fire beneath, over which it is dangerous to walk, but I thought I had met all this in my Preface, which was intended to obviate the calumnies and reproaches which I foresaw would be used against me ; and I think if it is diligently and equitably examined it will content for the most part the most rigid censors. My life must answer for the rest, which, like my writings, is free, open, and exposed to public view. I call God to witness that I have written without favour or hatred to any. I have neither love nor hatred, except love of virtue and hatred of vice. The principal law of history is not only to speak the truth, but to speak it boldly. Take away this liberty, which I know they blame in me, you blind its eyes, you tear it in pieces, you destroy its life. I know that they demand of me a more open detestation of our adversaries in religion. In this matter I think I have said enough in my Preface. I will add that the laws under which we live at present do not allow us to speak otherwise, and since experience has taught us that arms are a deadly remedy in religious disputes, we ought to help it by the arts of peace, and thus strive to reach that reconciliation which is desired by all good men.'¹

To his friend M. Du Puy, De Thou writes :

¹ Buckley, vol. vii. Appendix i. p. 16.

'Christian charity constrains us to hope for the salvation of those who are not heresiarchs, and who, having been born of sectarian parents, do not doubt, in so many places where this evil has spread, that in that belief which we hold to be erroneous they shall find salvation.'¹

Of course it was idle to hope that with such sentiments the writer could expect to escape the condemnation of Rome. Caraccioli, an Italian monk, after an elaborate criticism of the book, came to the conclusion :

'Of this book and its author this is my opinion. I hold that the book ought to be utterly abolished and condemned, for that it contains so many foully pestilential passages, that it cannot be amended without an utter destruction of the history. As for the author, on account of the hideous hatred which he exhibits in it towards the Roman See and its greatest pontiffs, he is evidently a Calvinist, and for that reason to be reckoned among heretics of the first class.'²

To this opinion the Court of Rome soon came. In spite of the efforts of several friendly Cardinals and the kind offices of M. Du Puy, the French ambassador, there came forth in 1609 the decree of 'Ludovico Ystella Valentino, dell' Ordine de' Predicatori, Maestro del Sacro Palazzo Apostolico, Giudice ordinario,' &c. notifying that all the faithful were prohibited from reading or possessing the books following, and commanding all who possessed copies of them to bring them to the office of the Sacred Palace. In the list or index of prohibited works, Bishop Andrewes' *Tortura Torti* figures next before *Jacobi Augusti Thuani Historiæ*, so that the historian was gibbeted in good company.³ In the same list may also be found the *Mare Liberum* of Grotius ; and not often has one of these contemptible documents exhibited a conjunction of three greater names. The most learned bishop of the Anglican Church ; the most acute publicist of his day, the man who may fairly be called a very encyclopedia of learning, are linked together with the most candid, painstaking, and upright of historians in a joint condemnation by Rome ! Who will not sympathize with the historian in his eloquent appeal to Posterity to reverse the judgment thus cruelly and wickedly passed against him ?

'Libertatis ego nimis verique quod acer
Assertor fuerim, vitiorumque horridus osor,
Et Romæ et nostrâ passim traducor in aula.

¹ Buckley, vol. vii. Appendix i. p. 16.

² *Ibid.* p. 57.

³ *Ibid.* p. 36.

Quid faciam ? quo me vertam ? quo iudice causam
 Defendam ? Iudex idem accusator et index.
 Tu modo, Posteritas, ades incorrupta roganti,
 Et patrocinium desertæ suscipe causæ ;
 Scripsimus ista tibi, nil nos ingrata moramur
 Judicia, et vili plausus mercede redemptos
 Nil admirantis præter præsentia, vulgi.
 Tempus erit, quo, nunc quæ non ita grata, placebunt ;
 Cumque odio fuerit satis invidiæque litatum,
 Præmia pro meritis constabunt justa labori.’¹

When the great tragedy of the assassination of Henry IV. took place, De Thou, in common with all good Frenchmen, was deeply grieved. The events which followed did not tend to raise his spirits. He saw the policy of Henry IV. reversed under the queen regent. Ultramontane principles were now in the ascendant, and the fair promise of the previous reign was marred. Personally he failed to obtain the post of first President of Parliament, which he considered fairly his due, and in disgust at his rejection he wrote a long letter to his friend Jeannin, in which he expatiates upon his wrongs, though at the same time professing a lofty indifference to royal favours. It must be owned that a considerable amount of vanity is apparent in this epistle.

‘I grieve,’ he writes, ‘for the injury I have sustained in my own person. I grieve more because greater injury has been offered to the commonwealth, and I always considered that I was not born for myself alone, but for my friends and my country. I began to write before the civil war was extinguished. That I have preserved the most uncorrupt fidelity, without hatred or affection, with no other object in view but the glory of God and the public good, I call God Himself to witness, who endowed me with ability to complete so voluminous a work in the midst of numerous avocations. I do not presume to think myself equal to many of my predecessors in the graces of style, in luminous arrangement, or weight of sentiment, but in diligence and fidelity I yield to none. I expected the attacks of malice, but the event has exceeded my expectation. Circumstances combined to make me an object of easy oppression to the Court of Rome. Their censures were levelled at two marks, viz. the concern I had in framing the edict in favour of the Protestants, and the freedom of my history, particularly in defending the rights of my country. I became their victim. I soon experienced in the Queen the same change which the King had manifested. I was excluded from parliament and from favour at Court. This flagrant ingratitude makes my private injury a public concern. It is publicly remarked that the factious and discontented now bear sway ; the same spirit prevails which shook the kingdom twenty-five years ago, and ruined it under King

¹ Collinson, Appendix i.

Henr
 Peopl
 Coun
 Papal
 These
 separ

D
 Amo
 friend

‘Ador
 real a
 cerely
 count
 domes
 presen

De T
 same
 reply
 with
 with
 prefac
 reflect
 finally
 power
 the li
 longe
 narrat
 latter
 have
 childr
 who w
 fortun
 men o
 cert w
 when
 friend
 had a
 to him
 for his
 sumpt
 As De
 equal
 for acc

Henry III., and was in continual hostility to his illustrious successor. People now begin to talk of the promulgation of the edicts of the Council of Trent, and express their fears of the extent to which the Papal authority may be established during the minority of the King. These public murmurs prove that the injury done to me is inseparably connected with the common cause.¹

De Thou had many sympathizing friends in his troubles. Among others the learned Isaac Casaubon, ever his close friend, writes to him from England :

'Adorned and furnished as you are by Heaven itself with so many real advantages, of which no external violence can deprive you, I sincerely think that, considering your own benefit and that of your country ; considering your friends, your favourite studies, and your domestic convenience, you have the greatest reason to rejoice on the present occasion.'

De Thou, after his first outbreak, seems to have taken the same view of the circumstances. 'I am here,' he writes in reply, 'in my own house, preparing for that honourable leisure with all possible content.' He now applied himself again with diligence to the composition of his History. In a sort of preface to the part now commenced, he goes over again his reflections on public affairs as they concerned himself, and finally declared his intention of devoting the remainder of his powers to the relation of the events of the last ten years of the life of the great king. His life was not sufficiently prolonged to enable him to finish the task. He brought the narrative down to 1607, and in the year 1617 he died. The latter years of De Thou's life, while thus engaged, seem to have been singularly happy and prosperous. With a wife and children whom he tenderly loved, a number of devoted friends who were living in constant intercourse with him, a plentiful fortune, and the respect and admiration of all the learned men of Europe, it is hard to picture any condition less in concert with the lugubrious forebodings in which he had indulged when Court favour was denied him. De Thou's learned friends delighted in the grand collection of books which he had accumulated. Henry Stephens, the great printer, writes to him with enthusiasm for his liberality in purchasing books, for his accurate knowledge of the best editions, and for the sumptuousness of the bindings which he bestowed on them. As De Thou was principal librarian of the famous and unequalled Royal Library of Paris, he had the best opportunity for acquiring a deep knowledge of bibliography. By his will

¹ Buckley's *Thuanus*, Appendix to vol. vii.

he directed his magnificent library to be preserved intact, but after the death of his youngest son it was sold, the books being disposed of for less than their bindings had cost De Thou.¹ Of the publication of his History after his death mention has already been made. Extracts from the History, principally consisting of character-sketches, have been published under the name of 'Thuana,' and parts of it have been translated into English. It has been well pointed out by Mr. Collinson that in many ways De Thou resembles Lord Clarendon. His delight in character-sketches is a palpable instance of resemblance. But the pure and racy English of Lord Clarendon is vastly superior as a style to the tiresome and affected Latin of De Thou. It is true that he wrote the Latin tongue with much skill. Grotius declared that his Latin was so good that after reading it he felt ashamed of composing again in the same language. But Latin is altogether an uncongenial tongue to express the shiftings and windings of modern affairs. The names, for instance, of the actors in the History had to be forced into an antiquated form, and this was done by De Thou so clumsily that one of the chief labours entailed upon his learned editor Mr. Carte was to discover who were meant by the strange appellations with which the text abounded.² Another weak point in De Thou's History was his deficient knowledge of foreign affairs, and especially it may be said of the affairs of England. A glaring instance of this is the elaborate and studied panegyric which he indites on the character of Queen Elizabeth. This he concludes with the words, 'Time will be her best panegyrist, and probably never has produced or will produce a woman superior to her.'³ Time, however, has done for the famous queen quite a different office, and has ruthlessly thrown her down from that pedestal on which De Thou's admiration endeavoured to place her. But after making all the deductions fairly called for, it remains the fact that there are few greater historical works than that of De Thou; and none perhaps in which is more evident a fair, candid, and equitable spirit, not swayed by bitterness or sectarian animosity, but rising superior to low impulses and motives, and intent only upon setting forth the truth and upholding the right.

¹ Collinson, p. 267.² *Ibid.* p. 291.³ *Ibid.* p. 380.

1. P

2. P

3. S

4. E

5. S

It w
head
their
religi
our c
tendi
shoul
ment
And
add
count
with
and n
and a
and p
self e
Graco

T
the o
gener
deaco
by E.
Burro
thank
the B
rule,
cured

ART. VI.—SERMONS.

1. *Parochial and Plain Sermons.* By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, B.D., formerly Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford. Edited by the Rev. W. J. COPELAND, B.D., Rector of Farnham, Essex. New edition, 8 vols. (London, 1837.)
2. *Parochial Sermons.* By E. B. PUSEY, D.D. (London, 1832-1882.)
3. *Sermons for the Christian Year.* By the late Rev. JOHN KEBLE. Eleven vols. (Oxford, 1887.)
4. *Easter in St. Paul's.* Sermons bearing chiefly on the Resurrection of Our Lord. Second edition, 2 vols. (London, 1887.)
5. *Sermons preached at Brighton by the late Rev. Frederick W. Robertson.* Series i.-iv. New edition. (London, 1886.)

IT will be readily allowed that the sermons placed at the head of this article hold a peculiar and paramount place in their generation. They are typical instances of genius and religion, energizing didactically in our own times and in our own Church. Very unlike they are each to each, but tending by different roads to the one good end. All preachers should study them; none should try to imitate, but rather mentally and morally to appropriate and assimilate them. And when they have done this they will still have need to add to their store treasures from other centuries and other countries; and, moreover, all their own growing sympathies with men, and growing knowledge of human sorrows, joys, and needs; all that Holy Scripture teaches them progressively, and all that they learn at the foot of the Cross in meditation and prayer. The true preacher must always be himself, himself enriched, instructed, and elevated by experience and by Grace.

The exceptional sermons cited above are by no means the only proof of what preaching has done and does in our generation. Excellent volumes have been published by Archdeacon Hare, Dr. Arnold, Bishop Armstrong, Isaac Williams; by E. Paget, C. P. Eden, T. T. Carter, J. M. Neale, H. W. Burrows, Baring Gould, Archbishop Trench, &c.; and we must thankfully acknowledge the unprinted sermons of Cahon Body, the Bishop of Ripon, and pre-eminently—if we take the old rule, 'We count him a good physician whose patients we see cured'—the present Bishop of Lincoln.

Neither by recommending the study of the sermons which stand at the head of this article is it to be supposed for a moment that ancient homilists are to be neglected, especially SS. Chrysostom, Augustine, Leo, and our own countrymen Andrewes—who is a gold mine—Donne, Sanderson, and J. Taylor. None of these can be spared; and we venture to recommend students not to read one author through and then another, but to alternate the books, so as not to fall into the groove of any one man and yet to be instructed by all.

There is great need for us to do our best. Time was when sermons were everything, and now they scarcely hold their own ground. From being idolized they have come to be just tolerated, and by some people scarcely that. Sermons used to be an hour long—witness the old hour glass—and now twenty minutes is often thought ample; and not a tithe of sermon volumes is now issued. They have ceased to be popular literature with serious people. Witty Bishop Andrewes said:

‘It puts me in mind of the great absurdity, as St. Paul reckons it. “What is all hearing?” saith he. All hearing? Yes; all is hearing with us. But that all should be hearing is as much as if all one’s body should be nothing but an ear; and that were a strange body! The corps, the whole body of some men’s profession, all godliness with some, what is it but hearing a sermon? The ear is all, the ear is all that is done, and but by our ear-mark no man should know us to be Christians. They were wont to talk much of auricular confession; I cannot tell, but now all is turned to auricular profession.’¹

So again, later on, Herbert Thorndike:

‘It is necessary that the world should be cleared of this imposture that reigneth—that two sermons every Sunday is the due way of keeping the Sabbath among Christians or of advancing God’s public service.’²

We ourselves can remember churches in which the congregation roused up from torpor when the sleek verger ushered the preacher up the stairs and shut the pulpit door, when he in huge bands, with white pocket-handkerchief at his side, elaborate whiskers, and well-dressed hair, turned over the Bible or his sermon, in lavender gloves, and looked complacently all round the galleries, whilst all was hushed and by their face and manner the people said, ‘Now it is come at last. This is the business of the day.’

All this is past except with the sects, and the sermon is

¹ Sermon VII. *Of Repentance and Fasting*.

² *Due Way of Composing Differences*, sec. 40.

generally a small thing in the estimate of the congregation, an appendage, an unwelcome necessity. Need this be so? No. There is many a clergyman who can look down before he begins, with no vainglorious glance, but with assurance of a kindly welcome, feeling that his people meet him halfway and are confident that they will receive something from his lips which will do them good.

How inspiring is the feeling that love is addressing itself to love, that an open heart of affection is pouring itself out to receptive hearts of affection! Who is not happy when he is speaking to his own dear people of that which concerns the glory of God and the salvation alike of the shepherd and his sheep?

We know how severely tasked are the clergy of our towns, how little time they have for study and for thought. We would not, then, be hard upon them, but rather give them all encouragement. How is it, indeed, that these same overworked men are after all the best preachers that we have?

But as to the country clergy we beg their pardon when we say that there is no reason why they should not—as a rule—become first-rate preachers. True, they have dull understandings and great ignorance to encounter in their audience, sleepy minds and bodies; true that they know so much of the state of their people that they lose heart; and all high appeals come to be felt unreal. True, all this and more; but then let it be remembered what leisure they have for reading and preparation, how fearless they may be of criticism, how they may train themselves by cottage lectures and the like. Perhaps they could help one another by combination, consultation, kindly criticism, and suggestions. Anyhow we hope to be excused when we say that it is our firm conviction that the sermons of the country clergy might be raised almost incalculably, and that they might educate themselves into as fine a body of preachers as the world has seen, and be welcomed in town pulpits by their weary brethren with gratitude and joy.

Oh, let them not lose heart! Let them trust Him who sent them to make them what He needs for His poor sheep.

In order to promote this advance we will now venture to make some practical suggestions which may possibly be useful to young men, and which will be readily excused by their elders, whose experience has not only taught them better but also taught them how much need there is of any little help which can be had.

I. Preparation.

(a) General. The preacher must study. He must be,

according to his vows, 'diligent in reading of the Holy Scriptures and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same.' He must study if he is to bring forth things old and new. He must have a basis of fact, and then power to teach fact acceptably. He does not want novelty, which is perilous; but he does want freshness. This freshness is gained by wide reading of history, biography, missionary histories, poetry, and by intercourse with the people. Whatever a man works out for himself—with whatsoever aids—is his own, becomes part of himself. As it is an unspeakable misfortune for anyone to derive all his religion from catechisms and manuals, so also it is a great injury to the preacher to form himself and his sermons upon helps to preachers, skeletons, books of anecdote, and the like. He who contents himself with such sources of thought will always be a very ordinary preacher, for he will be a very ordinary man in the bad sense of the word. He will be contracted, jejune, cold, stationary, like a tree planted in a hole whose roots go round and round and never spread; and a poor sort of tree it becomes.

(b) Special preparation. A subject should be chosen as soon as possible. Vacant moments, which allow thought, should be utilized. Commentaries, books of devotion, any and all should be referred to for suggestions. Notes of thoughts should be made and weeded out. It would be well to consider how the subject will strike the hearers, how it can be made most clear to their powers and dispositions, most likely to be understood and received; for it does not follow that the thoughts which come first to the preacher, which are the most beautiful and in themselves the most excellent, are those which the flock will care to feed upon or be able to assimilate. The preacher himself often turns away from thoughts which seem too high for him and which are alien to his mind. How much more, then, the less educated may be expected to do so.

As for subjects, the Church seasons, Gospel, Epistle, Lessons, should come first; then subjects which do not come out of them. For instance, there are eighteen miracles and eighteen parables which do not find place in the Gospels. Old Testament history is too often neglected; yet few topics are more profitable and engaging than those suggested in it. Bishop Hall's *Meditations* are a mine of gold.¹ Sermons

¹ It has been found useful to make a note of any subject for a sermon which may be suggested by reading or circumstances, and to add thoughts to the notice, waiting for an occasion to use them. Thus a preacher may have twenty or thirty topics in hand clamouring for an opportunity of usefulness.

should
hortat
exhaus
ἡθους is
may be
Patter
like re
affecti
temper
former
prayer
alone.
must s
the eq
The st
vary w
natura
sion of

'Th
human
ear ple
in a m
fruit of
This re
prepar
prayer
that th
is said
sermon

'To
great se
'To
ambassa
fancy.'
The vi
subseq
unfold
over th
but it i
still, un
what tr
the she
their c

¹ Qu
² Bis

should not be always dogma, nor always moral, nor always hortatory. Dogma, needful both as foundation and support, exhausts the reasoning powers, and if not supplemented by *ῥῆσος* is cold, only touches part of the man. Much the same may be said of moral teaching, unless it make Christ the Pattern and so reach the feelings; whilst hortatory sermons, like revivals and other religious excitements, exhaust the affections. They either fail to heat, or by heating raise the temperature, which is bound to fall, and to fall below its former level, unless maintained by rules and practice and prayer and sacraments. All are needful, but none will do alone. None can safely exclude the others. So the preacher must see that he does not follow his own bent, but preserves the equilibrium of teaching. There should be variety, relief. The style of composition and the manner of delivery should vary with the subject. It is sure to do so if the preacher is natural. The style and manner will then be a simple expression of thought and feeling.

‘The art of men and the art of God are very different. The human spirit knows how to give to truths a turn which flatters the ear pleasantly; the Spirit of God turns them in the mouth of saints in a manner which converts the hearts invincibly. The first is the fruit of study, the other of prayer.’¹

This remark emboldens us to say that the first step in special preparation is prayer, as it is the last step before preaching—prayer for the poor preacher, prayer for the hearer, prayer that the Word may have free course and fructify. Bossuet is said to have spent half an hour in prayer before every sermon.

‘To be heartily in love with the truth one recommends is the great secret of becoming a good preacher.’

‘To preach our own thoughts, forsaking God’s Word, is like an ambassador who neglects his prince’s instructions and follows his own fancy.’²

The vicar of an Essex church which the writer of this paper subsequently served used to preach from a roll which he unfolded as he proceeded. One day it took flight and went over the heads of the congregation. It seems very absurd, but it is only what hundreds of preachers have done and do still, unwarned by the words of good Bishop Wilson: ‘With what truth can it be said that the sheep hear his voice when the shepherd speaks of things or in such a manner as is above their capacity?’³

¹ Quesnel on Col. iv. 4.

² Bishop Wilson, *Sac. Priv. Monday Med.*

³ *Ibid. Friday Med.*

We used to hear a great deal about preaching Christ from the lips of a certain party in the Church. Too often this meant that nothing but the Atonement and faith in it were to be announced. But assuredly the statement is capable of a good interpretation. As Christ is the central Figure of the Old Testament history and Prophets, of the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, the Centre of the Church, the Centre of creation physical, human, angelic, so one way or another He must be the Centre of preaching. Christ foretold, coming, come; Christ born, living, dying, rising, ascended, interceding, ruling, judging; Christ the Light and Christ the Life; Christ perfect Man and perfect God, sometimes revealed in the one nature especially, sometimes in the other, and revealed in both as God and Man—should be always appearing in sermons and through sermons, which should be manifestations of Him who is the manifestation of the Father. This suggestion—we venture to say—requires careful consideration in these days.¹

2. Adherence to the subject. Sermons are too often an accumulation of thoughts not clearly arising from the subject, nor very plainly belonging to it; hence they are very hard to remember. In proof of this assertion—if any be needed—let any preacher examine what he has carried away from the sermon of another. We confess that when we hear a thoroughly good sermon we take it away in our minds and use it ourselves with such alterations as our inferior powers, or the calibre of our hearers, or our own individuality produce. Well, the year before the last, whilst on an excursion, we heard two sermons at an abbey church, two at a cathedral, two at an important port, two at a country village, and we only took home one with us in the head. Of course it may be said that we did not care for the subjects or the treatment of the others. Still a distinct, well followed out discourse would not have slipped through the mind, as these sermons did. Let this anecdote, however, be counted for what it is worth; for the experience of the reader will only too surely confirm our allegation. Now, a sermon should not be a bush bearing on many stems a number of fruits or flowers, but a tree, every branch of which clearly belongs to the trunk. To take a geological simile, it should not be a conglomerate; to take a zoological one, it should be vertebrate, not invertebrate. There is a great difference between a public office with any number of unconnected rooms in it and a cathedral from the

¹ There is an excellent and suggestive sermon on this subject in the volume of sermons cited above by the late lamented C. P. Eden, published when he gave up the Church of St. Mary the Virgin at Oxford.

nave of
one
various
or two
1, 2, 3,
along
In
to his
instead
we have
abandon
sermon
beginning
toward
eloquent
sostom
arrange
treatment
the pre
clearne
remember

3. I
thought
to sup
than L
and Pr
explain
sophy
theolog
advanta

If v
ourselv
explain
explain
rural co
gations.
On ano
of the v
said, 'A
and he
decapita

4. I
an illus
unable
how ag
VOL.

nave of which open out choir, aisles, and chapels. In short, one permanent idea should prevail, worked out it may be variously, but always being worked out; and then a corollary or two may come in at the end, but not thoughts No. 1, 2, 3, 4, &c., each one of which, like the waves of the sea along the sand, erases the mark of its predecessor.

In old times divisions and subdivisions kept the preacher to his subject, but they were too numerous for the hearer, and instead of assisting the memory confused it. In these days we have gone to the opposite extreme, and by a reaction have abandoned subdivision. It is not a bad plan to map out a sermon under two or three heads, to tell our people at the beginning what we propose to do, and to sum up the results towards the end on the fingers—if we like—and then give eloquence her head—if we have any—the *ῥηθικόν* of St. Chrysostom at the conclusion of his homilies. Not that this arrangement is indispensable, for variety and freedom of treatment is very desirable; but that ordinarily it assists both the preacher and the hearer, the former in the sequence and clearness of his reasoning, the latter in comprehending and in remembering.

3. Hard words are to be avoided, but not more than hard thoughts. We cannot entirely avoid either. It is a mistake to suppose that Saxon words are always more intelligible than Latin, or that any words which are frequent in the Bible and Prayer-Book, however long they may be and hard to explain, are to be disused. How many new terms has philosophy forced into our language recently! Well, then, let theology retain her own terms, which have at any rate the advantage of prescription.

If we try to explain, we must be quite sure first that we ourselves have a clear notion of the matter which we wish to explain. We once heard a preacher explain sin. Did he explain it? Anyhow he said with great complacency to a rural congregation, 'Sin is the transgression of statutory obligations.' We need not be afraid of calling a spade a spade. On another occasion we heard a preacher who was ashamed of the word 'beheaded;' so upon St. John Baptist's Day he said, 'At last he was beheaded.' Then his heart misgave him, and he added, 'that is to say, he was decapitated—he was decapitated.'

4. Illustrations. They must really be illustrations. In an illustrated book nothing is more provoking than to be unable to find the page to which the engraving refers. So how aggravating to the hearer to be unable to identify the

illustration with the subject, and to have to say to himself, 'What has it to do with the matter?' Again, they must not take the place of a subject. To be 'decked with bay and rosemary' is a pleasing addition to the feast, but what if there be nothing in the dish but bay and rosemary? One anecdote is enough for a sermon, quietly stated in its facts and forcibly applied in its moral. Certainly illustrations from nature, from history, from what is going on around, from the callings and habits of the people addressed, are most serviceable; but is it not an open question whether these may not be—nay, often are—overdone? We find them used very sparingly by the grand old preachers of antiquity. But what we do find in them is what we seldom find among ourselves—namely, Scriptural illustration. How is it that the lives of the patriarchs are so seldom referred to—of David, of Daniel, of the Apostles—the dealings of God with His people, and of His people with Him? Secular illustrations are apt to have a secular savour, and tend to produce a secular atmosphere, whilst the preacher is trying, we suppose, to produce one which is spiritual. May we suggest that our first inquiry should be, 'Does not the Bible afford me an illustration?' before we betake ourselves to the world for assistance, and certainly before we go to books of anecdotes? Oh, what degradation! How poor we must be when we ask alms of a manual of clerical anecdotes! Better surely go to such books as Canon Rawlinson's, the *Reports of the Palestine Exploration Society*, the *Land and the Book*, and other works which are akin to the mind and the subject of a preacher of the Gospel of Christ. Of course we do not wish to discourage the use of a good anecdote from Herodotus, or Livy, or books of travels, or from hearsay; far from it; but we plead for a more frequent use of Biblical illustration and against a lowering resort to compilations formed like a Concordance, at once fostering idleness in the clergy and tempting them to deck out habitually with tinsel that which ought to be gold, and truly is gold if it be the Gospel of Christ. One of the most forcible illustrations is an appeal to the hearer's own history—that is to say, to conscience. When a preacher can ask his hearers with something of the love and simplicity—we know it can only be something—yet with something of the sympathy with which Bishop King can ask them, as a brother whether it is not so and so with them, or has been so of old time; whether their hearts do not bear witness both as to the past and the present that God has been such to them and they such to Him; and whether they do not feel and know that it would be well with them—yea, most blessed—

if they w
be differ
help if th
men than

Or it
some det
friends, a
the heav
the two s

It is
in a man
grace rea
body illu
takes of I
and be fo
and the l
ledged re

These
stant pan
this is do
in themse
to sermon
which ma

5. Sty
aggeratio
is a natu
that the p
and irrita
herself.

Origin
rely on h
Still it is
gift, powe
born a po
originality
violates t
is to be se

Simpl
thing is r
you to tr
plain. I
&c. Simp
intelligenc
on the lev
If sim

himself,
not take
semary'
nothing
enough
applied
history,
habits of
t not an
en are—
rand old
is what
illustra-
seldom
he deal-
ch Him?
our, and
teacher is
al. May
not the
ourselves
e go to
poor we
ecdotes!
on's, the
and and
and the
ourse we
ote from
say; far
cal illus-
s formed
e clergy
sel that
e Gospel
appeal to
t. When
love and
yet with
can ask
m, or has
r witness
n such to
not feel
blessed—

if they were other than they are; whether they do not wish to be different, and will try; whether they are not sure of God's help if they try—surely no better illustration can be given to men than this, their own experience of God and of themselves.

Or it might be—with enlargement and carrying out into some detail—how do we feel and act to our parents, children, friends, and they to us? For there is a real parallel between the heavenly archetypal Parent and the earthly, between the two sets of affections and the two homes.

It is surely well to draw water out of the well which lies in a man's self, and to help him to heal himself, with God's grace ready to enlighten and aid him. The ailments of his body illustrate to him those of his soul. The care which he takes of his health and his property, his unwillingness to die and be forgotten, which are forecasts of immortality, all these and the like illustrations are understood and felt and acknowledged readily by all men.

These references should be fully drawn out, and the constant parables of our earthly condition elucidated. When this is done they are as interesting as any anecdote, and are in themselves more safe and spiritual than most of those aids to sermons which have their use to some men perhaps, but which may easily be overdone and over-relied upon.

5. Style and manner—simple, natural, individual. Exaggeration defeats itself, causing a reaction of feeling. There is a natural love of truth in man, and the moment we feel that the preacher is exceeding the truth we become suspicious and irritable. Truth not only defends herself, but avenges herself.

Originality is a dangerous gift, leading the possessor to rely on himself, form rash opinions, and use rash statements. Still it is a gift, and a rare gift; and if sanctified a precious gift, powerful for good. If we have it we have it, as a poet is born a poet, and we are accountable to the Giver. To seek originality is a contradiction, is to be sure not to have it, and violates the rule laid down, Simplicity. To seek originality is to be servile and to lower our moral character.

Simplicity of style and manner is not condescension. Nothing is more offensive than, 'Now, my dear friends, I want you to try and understand this. Now I will try to be very plain. I want you to meet me half way and do your best,' &c. Simplicity is not a conscious sinking to the level of lower intelligence. Simplicity is never conscious. She is always on the level of those she loves by sympathy.

If simplicity has any mannerisms she does not know it.

They are not assumed ; they are only individualities. They may be objectionable, and a kind friend, a real friend, will in that case warn the preacher to restrain them ; or they may have all the charm of what is genuine, natural—the true expression of the inward man.

A vehement gesture proceeding from vehement feeling is eloquent, whilst to stamp on the pulpit floor, or thump the Bible, or knock the board, is, unless required by the subject and the emotion of the preacher, disgusting.

‘ In man or woman, but far most in man,
And most of all in man that ministers
And serves the Altar, in my soul I loath
All affectation. ’Tis my perfect scorn ;
Object of my implacable disgust.
What ! will a man play tricks, will he indulge
A silly fond conceit of his fair form
And just proportion, fashionable mien,
And pretty face in presence of his God ?¹

Therefore avaunt all attitude and stare,
And start theatric, practised at the glass.
I SEEK DIVINE SIMPLICITY IN HIM
WHO HANDLES THINGS DIVINE.’²

Simplicity of manner, unless it arises from simplicity of character, is only an affectation. Of simplicity of character issuing in that of manner Fénelon said—

‘ This simplicity is manifested in the exterior. As the mind is freed from the idea of self we act more naturally, all art ceases ; we act rightly without thinking of what we are doing, by a sort of directness of purpose that is inexplicable to those who have no experience of it. To some we may appear less simple than those who have a more grave and practised manner ; but these are people of bad taste, who take the affectation of modesty for modesty itself, and who have no knowledge of true simplicity. This true simplicity has sometimes a careless and irregular appearance, but it has the charm of truth and candour, and sheds around it I know not what of pure and innocent, of cheerful and peaceful ; a loveliness that wins us when we see it intimately and with pure eyes. How desirable is this simplicity ! Who will give it to me ?’³

Strange ! Fénelon did not know that he possessed it supereminently ; nor did Keble.

¹ Only the year before last we ‘sat under’ a young preacher who leaned his head upon his hand during much of the sermon, showing his white hand and ring, and seeming more complacent than his hearers.

² Cowper, *The Task*, book ii.

³ *Selections from the Writings of Fénelon*, by Mrs. Follen, p. 120.

St
and sur

‘ I g
labours
attribute
that this
in publi
It is the
instead
patience
them.’¹

The
Presen
of thos
Christ
worthin
‘ As of
Christ

As
or mid
to the
cannot
surely
upon th
depend
upon th
him he

A s
noisy a
not mo
bastic
feeling
will no
which

It i
fairly s
it will
stop, c
abrupt
would

We
a failin
intelle
certain
toward

St. Vincent de Paul took the same view as to preaching, and surely he was a master in the work.

‘I give thanks to God for the blessing which He has given to the labours of . . . and for that which you recount that it ought to be attributed, to their manner of speaking simple and familiar. I hope that this example will confirm you in the practice of never speaking in publick nor in private but with simplicity, humility, and charity. It is the greatest secret that one can find to success in preaching, instead of the contrary practice, which only serves to exercise the patience of the hearers and to fill with vanity him who speaks to them.’¹

There are three thoughts helpful in time of need—1, God’s Presence, to which Cowper referred above; 2, the thought of those to whom we speak, immortal souls, sheep for whom Christ shed His precious blood; 3, the preacher’s own unworthiness to stand where he does and speak in God’s name. ‘As of sincerity, as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ’ (2 Cor. ii. 17).

As to whether a sermon should be written or extempore, or midway, i.e. preached from notes, is it not best to leave it to the preacher to find out what he can do well and what he cannot? Only, if he preaches a written sermon, he ought surely to take pains to know it well, and not to keep his eyes upon the manuscript, but look his people in the face. So much depends upon the expression of eye and mouth, so much upon the hearer feeling that the preacher is really speaking to him heart to heart.

A sermon should no more be monotonous in delivery than noisy and bombastic, and it need not be so if the preacher be not monotonous himself, any more than it need not be bombastic if the preacher is not so. If his matter varies, and his feelings vary with his matter—which they surely will do—he will not be monotonous, nor indeed can be. The interest which he feels will impart itself to his manner.

It is a mistake to prolong a sermon beyond where it should fairly stop. If it is well-reasoned and forcible, although long, it will not be too long; but when it ceases to be this it should stop, even if it were only ten minutes long; and the very abruptness of the cessation would be impressive, because it would be truthful; and nothing is so impressive as truth.

We know that to drop the voice at the end of a sentence—a failing only too common—spoils the period; but to drop intellectually or morally towards the close of the sermon is certainly worse. Too many a good discourse loses power towards the end, and the disappointed hearer wishes that it had

¹ Letter, June 14, 1656.

concluded before. 'Why did he not stop when he had reached such or such a point? but now he has marred his work, undone himself.'

Prayer before preaching is needful, in order that what is preached may be true and good, and have good success in the hearts of the hearers; but prayer after preaching is needed for the preacher's self. Whatever was good in the sermon was God's, the Giver of all good gifts; where it failed the weakness of man appeared. The less a preacher thinks of his sermon after it is over, the better. He need not think of it at all except as Dupanloup did, to humble himself in the dust. All glory to God and humiliation to man. The good is His; the evil, man's.

'It is God who gives His ministers, such as are humble, power over the hearts and souls of men; when distrusting themselves they ascribe all glory to God.'

'We take the work out of the hands of God when we are pleased with what we have done, and rob Him of the honour due to Him alone.'

'There have been many who, without any great learning or eloquence, yet by their communication in a humble and low way have instructed and converted more than famous preachers; for that they preached not themselves, but Christ Jesus, placing all their confidence in God.'¹

The writer of these words was an instance. His sermons were devoid of eloquence, but he produced a profound sensation in London pulpits when he left his island for a time.

It was said to a clergyman in our times, 'What an admirable sermon you preached to-day.' He answered, 'The devil told me this first, as I was coming down from the pulpit.' Nor is this all, for the preacher cannot but feel that he has condemned himself when condemning sins; and has spoken beyond himself and above himself when speaking of high and holy things, from which he is far removed, although it has been his duty to urge others to seek that which he has never attained. Too often the preacher is his own accuser, and he is more sad than vain, if he only reflects.

Well, then, let preachers fear their indolence and their 'own vain hearts' and their want of faith; and doing their very best fear nothing else, but be of good heart. Then, although they may not be admired or run after, they will have accomplished all that they had a right to expect, and more than they will know of until 'that Day.' They will have peace in their hearts, 'that best and truest gift,' and will receive the reward of those who 'turn many to righteousness.'

¹ Wilson's *Sacra Privata*, Friday Med.

1. Sy
2. Fa
I
3. Yo

THEY
tained
among
from
journa
train
were t
by the
suffer
vocati
we all
of the
lay el
action

TH
though
earlies
sentat
as a
ackno
the re
forty-
simila
was o
give i
eighty
has b
(p. 45)
we ho
presid

TH
the se
Laym
north
respec
to cre

ART. VII.—THE NATIONAL SYNOD.

1. *Synodus Anglicana*. (London, 1702.)
2. *Fasti Eboracenses*. Lives of the Archbishops of York.
By the Rev. JAMES RAINE, M.A. (London, 1863.)
3. *York Journal of Convocation*. (1861-1865.)

THEY who care to recall the stolid resistance so long maintained against the revival of Convocation, are aware that among the captious and irrelevant objections heaped together from all quarters by prelates, dignitaries, lawyers, leading journalists, Liberal statesmen, and the heavy Low-and-Slow train of Church-obstructives, in and out of Parliament, there were three genuine difficulties, always more clearly discerned by the party of progress than by its opponents. We did not suffer ourselves to be diverted from the object in view. 'Convocation' could only be revived as it stood; but when revived we all knew that it would be confronted, first by the inadequacy of the representation of the clergy, next by the demand for a lay element, and then by the need of securing the concurrent action of the two provinces.

The first was promptly disposed of at York by the happy thought of revising the various writs in conformity with the earliest precedents, and so restoring the archidiaconal representation throughout the province. The question was treated as a matter of ecclesiastical procedure, which Lord Selborne acknowledges to be within the archbishop's prerogative; and the result is a Lower House of twenty-seven dignitaries and forty-eight proctors returned by direct election of the clergy. A similar process in the larger province, where the representation was originally archidiaconal, as it still is in principle, would give 150 elected proctors (in place of seventy-two) against the eighty-eight *ex officio* seats. Here, however, a larger scheme has been framed, which was set forth in our last number (p. 459). If the law officers of the Crown continue inexorable we hope it is not too late to fall back on the powers of the president.

The archbishop's authority has proved sufficient to meet the second difficulty, by calling into existence the House of Laymen. One effect of this experiment is to retort on the northern province the disparity experienced in the other with respect to the clerical representation. If it were possible to create an effective House of Laymen at York, it would

obviously add to the risk of separate provincial action. Such perhaps is the feeling of the two primates themselves, in calling attention at this time to the inconvenience of the 'zigzagged line' intersecting the National Church. Each has suggested a scheme for closer union between the two Convocations; and with the headlong zeal that characterizes so many of our modern reforms, the Church House already invites contributions as a home for the regenerated National Synod.

The time is come, then, for the practical discussion of the last great difficulty in the way of our revived Convocations. We submit that it can only be successfully dealt with from the historical point of view. We must beware of plunging into another protracted struggle with the law officers of the Crown. It is not a question that can be treated experimentally, like the Lay House which has no place in the constitution of the Church. The two Convocations are the fundamental elements of our ecclesiastical organization. They are older than the nation itself—the main links that unite it to the Catholic Church; older than the parishes, the cathedrals, and the greater part of our existing dioceses. They are the sources of all our Church law, worship, and discipline. Of such bodies the very life blood is precedent; if we want proof of its practical value in dealing with the question before us, we have only to compare the swift success of the historical process at York with the still fruitless efforts of the Lower House of Canterbury for its own reform. Our first object, then, is to review the relations of the two provinces from the historical point of view: to know the course of their joint action in the past is the safest guide to improvement for the future.

We begin with dismissing the idle theory that the 'sacred Synod of this nation,' referred to in the 139th Canon, is a different body from the two Provincial Synods comprehended under the name of 'Convocation.' No such Synod as this theory imagines ever sat in this island. Our Provincial Synods have been united in a National Council; but whether united or apart, they always preserved their own constitution, and were 'the true Church of England by representation' in their respective provinces. The decrees of one became national by the concurrence of the other, just as Councils became General by the acceptance of national Churches, whether or no they were formally represented in the original Synods. The fact is so familiar to canonists that we should not have adverted to it, if we had not met with some worthy people in eager pursuit of a will-of-the-wisp that can only lead them into a bog.

cour
Can
by c
of t
king
'Ex
Scot
the
Wig
and
The
cont
Nor
nor
supp
prim
Egbr
but
Prov
Paul
Yor
only
and
thou
welc
rece
Cou

mac
of a
king
the
was
plin
was
prim
neit
Gre
und
that
bish
are

A second elementary fact is that a Provincial Synod in this country implies an archbishop. Theodore was Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of All England, in a sense inherited by only three of his successors. They were sole archbishops of the English Church three centuries before an English kingdom existed. At no time, however, was England an 'Exarchate.' Theodore's mission was to unite the British, Scotch, and Roman successions in one national Church, under the superintendence of the Pope. He was substituted for Wighard, who was nominated by the kings of Northumbria and Kent, but died at Rome before he could be consecrated. There is no doubt that Wilfrid aspired to the pall, but his controversy with the Celtic bishops made him obnoxious in Northumbria, and being a Northumbrian himself, neither king nor bishops wanted him in Kent. Enjoying the temporal support of the two most powerful monarchs, Theodore was primate of the whole island—Oswy's archbishop as much as Egbert's. He has even been styled Archbishop of York;¹ but there was no Archbishop of York, and consequently no Provincial Synod, till Egbert obtained the pall, A.D. 735. Paulinus himself did not receive it till after his flight from York, and the five intervening occupants of the see were only diocesan bishops. The Councils held by Theodore and Brihtwald in the several kingdoms were Pan-Anglican, though occasionally employed on local questions. They welded the English Church into the Catholic communion by receiving the creeds and the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils.

The existing provincial organization dates from the primacy of Egbert. It is not a subdivision, but a confederation of autonomous Churches. Northumbria was an independent kingdom, extending from the Trent to the Forth, and from the German Ocean to the Isle of Man. Its mother Church was not Canterbury but Iona. The Culdee name and discipline lingered at York Minster in the reign of Henry I.² It was at the king's request that Theodore was invested with the primacy, and when the demand was made for a native primate, neither Rome nor Canterbury could gainsay the constitution of Gregory. The marvellous progress of the Northumbrian Church under the long primacy of Egbert, and of the three disciples that followed him, owed nothing to external influence. Five bishoprics supplied the synodal action, of which the fruits are seen in Egbert's *Excerptions*, and Wulfstan's *Laws of the*

¹ Raine, 50.² *Ibid.* 2.

Northumbrian Priests. Albert's magnificent minster with its thirty altars stood intact to the Norman Conquest. It was here that Eanbald, assisted by three of his suffragans, consecrated King Eardulf on June 25, 796. The School of York, with its splendid library, where Alcuin studied and taught, was the light of the English Church till quenched in the Danish invasion. The second Eanbald was a member of Charlemagne's literary coterie. In one of Alcuin's letters the great scholar asks his former pupil—the 'Symeon' of the imperial Court—to assist Ethelhard of Canterbury in his struggle to regain the Mercian primacy, which Offa had transferred to Lichfield. He is credited with the authorship of the York Use, which Canon Simmons holds to be neither more nor less than Charlemagne's palatial Missal.¹ There could be no stronger proof of his independence of Canterbury, since a Council at Cloveshoo, about fifty years before, decreed the use of the Roman *exemplar*. It was at York that Alcuin conferred with the English divines on the Caroline Books, and we suspect that the Council of Frankfort thought much more of the Archbishop of York than of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The fall of Northumbria embittered the dislike of the Angles to the Saxons, whom they had always looked down upon. The kingdom was shattered to pieces by the Danish inroads. The Church not only converted the assailants, but preferred their alliance to the southron yoke. The conversion was the swiftest upon record; within a century from their first appearance in the Humber the thrones of Canterbury and York were both occupied by full-blooded Danes; still the gulf between the north and south was far from being bridged over. In spite of Athelstan's munificent gifts, Danish kings reigned in York for twenty years after the victory of Brunnenburgh. His archbishop, Wulstan, was deposed and imprisoned by Edred for complicity with the Danes. His successors, Oskytal and Oswald, though Danes themselves, had little influence in the north. York was practically a Danish city: it was thronged with Danish merchants, who made the commercial mart which was its glory in the Middle Ages.² The earls who replaced the kings were more Danish than English. Canute was already King of Northumberland, East Anglia, and all the north of England, when the southern half fell to him on the death of Edmund Ironside; he became the first undisputed King of England just fifty years before the Norman Conquest.

¹ *Lay Folks' Mass Book*, p. 353.

² Raine, p. 123.

In all this period there is not a trace—we might say there was no possibility—of any subjection of the northern primate to the southern. The alleged submission of Archbishop Adulph, which imposed upon Collier, is known to be one of the forgeries of the Cantuarians under Lanfranc. The prelate who signed it was bishop of Lindsey. The archbishop was indeed a suffragan of Canterbury by reason of the bishopric of Worcester, which he held *in commendam* with York;—an arrangement which began with Oswald, and was continued to several of his successors, to supply the impoverishment of the northern primacy. By this way such unity of action as the times permitted was indirectly secured.

Lanfranc's attempt to exact a formal submission was a political measure in violation of all ecclesiastical precedents. The English Church was of no authority with the Normans. An archbishop of York had crowned the Conqueror in Westminster Abbey; another archbishop of York might perform the same office for a rival in York Minster. This was the danger that weighed with William and his Norman prelates at the Council of Windsor. Thomas had been long enough at York to know better. As often as the case was referred to Rome the forged bulls, from which the leaden seals had perished by time, while the parchment was miraculously preserved, were laughed out of court. Three Popes—Paschal, Gelasius, and Calixtus—pronounced for the independence of York. The last gave a bull of exemption, which Thurstan promulgated in York Minster (1121). Two others to the same effect were issued by Honorius II. (1126), and by Alexander III. (1179). In 1306 Archbishop Grenefeld proclaimed in the Synod of Ripon that the Archbishop of York had no superior in spirituals except the Pope, and anathematized any of his subjects who should appeal to Canterbury.¹ This canon, save as regards the Pope, being undoubtedly among the number to which the Act of Submission gives the authority of statute law, it is surprising that a writer of Mr. Joyce's learning can still contend for the Windsor decree; and the more so that it has little or no bearing on the subject of Convocation.

The distinguishing feature of an English Convocation is the formal representation of the parochial clergy, and of this we have not a particle of evidence before the twelfth century. The Episcopal Councils before the Conquest were doubtless attended by many priests and deacons, as well as kings and

¹ Trevor's *Two Convocations*, p. 83.

nobles and even abbesses. St. Hilda and St. Wilfrid (then an abbot), Agatho the priest, and James the deacon, besides the two kings, appear at Whitby. But there is no trace of formal representation, nor any clear evidence of the extent of their power. The Norman Councils were limited to the greater prelates—bishops and abbots; the Diocesan Synod was the proper utterance of the voice of the clergy. By the end of the eleventh century it had become usual to admit inferior prelates and capitular bodies to the Provincial Synod. Under the Papacy the provinces were held together by subjection to a common superior. The Roman legate developed from an *amicus curiæ* into the presiding judge: he cited the prelates and clergy before himself, displaced the archbishop, and dictated the constitutions. Still there was no change in the constitution of the Provincial Synods. The first use of the word 'Convocation' is at the Legatine Synod of 1125, and it appears that each was convened by its own archbishop, and included the archdeacons, abbots, and priors. The legate presided at the Council of Westminster (1176) when Roger of York was 'fustigated' for claiming precedence of Canterbury in right of seniority.

In the reign of Henry III. Archbishop Boniface was engaged in resisting the papal exactions, which, though at first opposed by the king and the laity, were supported by the whole power of the Crown when Henry had come to an agreement with Rome. The bishops and clergy were thrown upon their own resources, and the struggle tended to augment the interests of the lower clergy in the Convocation.¹ The archbishop's *Mandatum pro Convocatione* (1257) now commands his suffragans to bring with them the deans and priors of their cathedral churches, the abbots and independent priors and the archdeacons, each armed with letters procuratorial from their several congregations and subject clergy. The king forbade the assembly on pain of forfeiture of all their lands, but the archbishop deeming his duty to the Church superior to the royal prohibition, the Convocation was held in defiance both of king and pope. In the next reign Kilwarby's *Mandatum pro Convocatione* summons the archdeacons and the procurators of the whole clergy, and as no directions are given for their election, it would appear the usage was now established. The parochial clergy, who had always appeared in the Diocesan Synod in person, henceforth had their proctors in the Provincial Synod or Convocation. These particulars

¹ Trevor's *Two Convocations*, p. 29.

being *before* the attempt of Edward I. to enforce their appearance in Parliament, effectually dispose of Wake's theory of the Parliamentary origin of Convocation; a theory now exploded, though it was the stronghold of the anti-revivalists forty years ago, and for a time imposed even on the clear-sighted Bishop Thirlwall.

Edward's object was to bring the parochial benefices under the fiscal yoke which the Conqueror imposed on the bishoprics and religious houses. He sought to extend the bishops' writs of summons into a diocesan representation of the clergy, to treat with the Crown in common with the lay estates in Parliament. This would have extinguished the provincial division, superseded Convocation, and reduced the Church to a department of the State. The clause remains in the bishop's writ of summons to this day, and has at odd times been acted upon so far as the election of proctors; but we know nothing of their voting in Parliament, nor can anyone tell to which House they belong. It is open to any bishop to order an election to-morrow, but we doubt if he would get his proctors past the doorkeepers at Westminster. Fancy the Lord Chancellor's face if a posse of rural proctors had roared out 'Not content' from the bar, when their bishops voted for the Burials Bill! It would be a pretty experiment for a dean, but we cannot recommend it to any elected member of Convocation.

Convocation utters the distinct voice of the Church, independently of all temporal forms of government. The voice is as powerful (if not more so) in the American Republic as under the English Monarchy. The political privileges and restraints incidental to connexion with the State cannot abrogate the synodical principle of the Catholic Church from the Apostles downward. It is a theocratical, not a democratical, principle, deriving from the superior to the inferior, and not, like the House of Commons or the General Assembly in Scotland, working up from the people to their elected representatives. In the Church representation begins in jurisdiction. Bishops represent their dioceses *proprio jure*; inferior prelates by episcopal delegation within their prescribed limits; and proctors of the clergy by other grants from the source of authority.

All this was clearly discerned by the clergy in their long struggle with the Plantagenet policy. From first to last the controversy turned on the single question, whether their appearance should be before the archbishop in a consecrated place, or before the king in his court of Parliament. It ended in a compromise, by which the clergy agreed to give the king

his money in their own Convocations, and the king abandoned the attempt to force them into Parliament. Under this compromise, the very essence of which was the independent constitution of the ecclesiastical Synod, the clergy taxed themselves in Convocation for about three centuries; and two centuries have elapsed since the privilege was surrendered in exchange for the county franchise. Convocation remains in principle and substance the same as ever.

In one respect, indeed, the Parliamentary policy has been thought to have left its mark on Convocation. By those who are ever ready to assign a reason for phenomena which they do not understand, the clause in the bishops' writs is said to prescribe the representation, which the archbishop's writ of Convocation leaves undetermined. This conjecture—for it was never anything more—is now the stumbling-block in the way of the proposed enlargement of the Lower House. From the historical point of view it is a mere fiction. The facts now stated make it quite clear that the Parliamentary representation was taken from the *modus debitus* of Convocation, as recognized in the archiepiscopal mandates. This is evident from the clause itself; the *archdeacons* could only have been included in it because they were actually cited to Convocation. The dean and the capitular proctor were required to bind the chapter, the proctors of the clergy to bind the parochial incumbents; but the archdeacons represented no temporal interest whatever: the spiritual jurisdiction, in virtue of which they sit in Convocation, was not taxable; they could only have been summoned to Parliament because they were actually in Convocation. In the next place, the Parliamentary writ never had any effect on the Convocation of York, though equally applicable. The northern clergy continued to appear by archidiaconal proctors as before. Lastly, though it is true that in Canterbury only two proctors now appear for each diocese, the citations and elections are still mostly archidiaconal. It is *after* the election and return to the bishop that two proctors for the diocese are manufactured, by a process wholly inconsistent with the representative principle.

The true explanation of this singular anomaly we take to be this: when the attendance was a burden rather than a privilege, the archbishop left the number undetermined to meet the convenience of the clergy. A Constitution, printed in Lyndwood (1279), specifies two *at least* from every diocese, and when this number was accepted as sufficient in Parliament, the archbishop would be unwilling to insist on more in Convocation. Still the writs go out to the archdeaconries: in

som
in
retu
inte
rest
seat
shou
Selb

of th
thei
the
Low
sidie
gram
refor
Arch
of f
with
sprin
to fi
corre
to a
for a
bent
it wa
plain
and
recei
tions
a lax
vario
elast
more
prom
Syno
tion
vica
with
smal
adop
C
fore

some dioceses the elected proctors agree among themselves, in others the bishop settles it for them, that only two are returned to the archbishop. This appears to us the only intelligible explanation; it is clearly an indulgence, not a restraint. If all the archidiaconal proctors were to claim their seats, we see nothing to hinder them; and if the archbishop should see fit to enlarge the number, there is nothing in Lord Selborne's *Memorandum* to stand in the way.

Having now considered the separate origin and constitution of the two Convocations, we are in a condition to inquire into their united action. Under the Papacy this was secured by the subjection of the archbishops to a common superior. The Lower House was of little account beyond voting the subsidies, which were ordinarily proportioned to the supplies granted in Parliament, and presenting their *gravamina et reformanda*. There would be no lack of these when an Archdeacon of Richmond went on his visitation with a train of fifteen and sometimes four-and-twenty horsemen, each with a dog ready for a hunt, whenever a stag or a roe might spring from the cover on the roadside.¹ The parson had to find them all in provender. There are many canons in correction of this abuse; first, the archdeacons were limited to a given number of retainers. Then the clergy compounded for a procuration in money, to be shared between the incumbents when two churches were visited in the same day, seeing it was uncanonical to eat two dinners. Now and then complaint would be made of heresy, or of the intrusion of monks and friars. The archbishop would promulgate the constitutions received from Rome, or agreed upon by the bishops. Questions of ritual were disposed of at the visitations, and with a laxity that would astonish the Judicial Committee. The various Uses of cathedrals, abbeys, and dioceses provided an elasticity sufficient for every taste, and the sacraments were more thought of than the vestments. When Walter Gray promulgated a constitution on vestments in his Provincial Synod, the question was, not of their use, but of the distribution of the cost between the parishioners, the rectors, and the vicars. Canons of doctrine and discipline being in accordance with admitted principles, passed *nemine discrepante*. The smaller Synod followed the lead of the larger, and sometimes adopted its canons *en bloc*, as in 1462 and 1605.

Occasionally the two Convocations were congregated before the Papal Legate, but they were not amalgamated: each

¹ Canon Ornsby's *Diocesan History of York*, p. 164.

was convened in its own province and preserved its distinct existence and authority. Moreover, the Legatine Synod was less representative than the Provincial. The archbishops and bishops resented the humiliation of a foreign president, the clergy put in a scant appearance, and, what has been strangely overlooked, the Lower House of York was altogether absent. In the struggle with the Plantagenet policy it came out that neither Convocation had any authority out of its province. Bishops are bishops everywhere, but deans, archdeacons, and proctors are as local as mayors and common councils. Hence when the archbishop and bishops of the southern province, with a large part of the clergy, obeyed the king's summons to York (1322), they were unable to hold a Synod to grant a subsidy, because the absentees, not being obliged to appear out of their province, could not be pronounced contumacious, and the decree would be canonically invalid. The archbishop was obliged to return and call a lawful Synod in his own province. A similar failure occurred to the Archbishop of York at Lincoln (1327).¹ To surmount this obstacle Wolsey prorogued his Convocation from York to Westminster Abbey, an exempt monastery, and cited the Archbishop of Canterbury, with his Convocation then sitting at St. Paul's, to meet it before himself. The Southern Convocation appeared, but refused to proceed on the ground that having been elected to treat with their own archbishop, they must have new powers to confer with the legate. The Cardinal had to prorogue his own Convocation to his house at Whitehall, 'locum utique nostræ jurisdictionis Ebor. solitum et consuetum,' and there a subsidy was granted.² Hence it is clear that the Legatine Synod was really no more than the Convocation of Canterbury supplemented by the northern bishops. The canonical authority for its constitutions in the province of York would be their subsequent reception by the Provincial Synod.

Henry VIII. unquestionably aimed at a great deal more than the 'civil sword' of Article xxxvii. As *caput supremum cleri et ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, he challenged the spiritual obedience of the clergy 'usually called the English Church,' and congregated the two Synods before his vicegerent, in place of the papal legate. But the king was far too sensible of their representative character to attempt any change in their constitution. The queerest feat of the Cæsaropapacy was Cranmer's delivery of the pall to Archbishop Holgate. But unfortunately for Mr. Joyce's theory the submission

¹ Wilk. *Conc.* ii. 547 ; Trevor, p. 50.

² Trevor, p. 85.

was
Supr
the g
subm
was
apart
curre
full a
and t
N
Quee
Convo
Thirty
terbur
Bisho
The s
archie
sacra
indica
'Artic
utrius
A.D. 1
ordina
bisho
shown
and no
the H
bisho
tion of
was pu
one b
person
Archb
the Bi
author
Th
vision

¹ Th
Chapel
Sancti
illustriss
nulli ali
incident
commun
may sur
² Ess
VOL.

was not of York to Canterbury, but to their more terrible Supreme Head.¹ The Convocations were consulted apart on the great questions of the rejection of the Papacy and the submission of the clergy. When consulted concurrently there was no amalgamation. The Upper House of York signed apart, while the Lower House remained at York. The concurrent process saved time, but the united action was more full and distinct in the successive deliberations, first in London and then at York.

Neither did the abandonment of the obnoxious title by Queen Elizabeth effect any change in the relations of the two Convocations. The 'Synod of London,' which agreed on the Thirty-nine Articles, was composed of the Convocation of Canterbury, with the addition of the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Durham and Chester, who signed by themselves. The subscription expressly terms it a Provincial Synod; 'Nos archiepiscopi et episcopi utriusque provinciae regni Angliæ in sacra synodo *provinciali* legitime congregati.' The heading indicates the bishops of either province, not the clergy. 'Articuli de quibus convenit inter archiepiscopos et episcopos utriusque provinciae, et clerum universum in synodo Londini, A.D. 1562;' but the Acts printed by Gibson show it to be an ordinary Provincial Synod; there is no mention of the northern bishops, though they signed the Articles. Dr. Bennett has shown that the Lower House of York were in session at York, and never signed at all.² Still it appears from their Acts that the House was in communication on the subject with the archbishop in London, and there is no doubt of the synodal reception of the Articles in the northern province. The same course was pursued in enacting the Canons of 1571, save that only one bishop of the northern province (Chester) signed in person; the Archbishop of York subscribed by his proxy the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of Durham by the Bishop of Winchester. It does not appear that any authority of the Crown was required on either occasion.

These precedents show that the course pursued at the Revision of the Liturgy in 1661, instead of being so unique as

¹ The pallium was aspersed with holy water and delivered in Lambeth Chapel with the words: 'Ad honorem Dei Patris Optimi Filii et Spiritus Sancti, Intemerataeque Virginis Mariae, et totius cœlestis exercitus ac illustrissimi et serenissimi Domini nostri Henrici VIII. &c., cui soli et nulli alii obedientiam et fidelitatem debes.' Canon Ormsby relates the incident from the *Gentleman's Magazine* of Nov. 1860, to which it was communicated by Professor Stubbs. The 'beatification' of Henry VIII. may surely bear comparison with the 'adoration' of the Pope.

² *Essay XXXIX. Art. ch. vi.*

some suppose, was simply the established way of proceeding. The two Convocations were separately opened in their respective provinces. The Archbishop of York and two of his suffragans sat in consultation with the Upper House of Canterbury, appearing in their own synod by proxy. They served on committees in common with the southern bishops, the only difference being that the president *requested* the northern prelates, and *directed* the others.¹ The Synod at York was in communication with the archbishop on the revision, and at its conclusion the book was severally subscribed by the two Upper Houses and the Lower House of Canterbury, exactly as the Thirty-nine Articles were. In the usual course it would have been sent down to York for the Lower House there. But Parliament was impatient. The House of Commons had sent to the Lords a Bill of their own with a Prayer-Book of 1604, and the king wanted to supersede it by the Revised Book of Convocation. Unless the York subscription could be got by the end of next week, the archbishop wrote, 'we are lost.' To escape this danger, the House executed a proxy to eight persons, four of either province, and by six of these the subscription of the Lower House of York was executed in London on the same day with the others, December 21, 1661.

The proxy bears date November 30, and in the interval the House transmitted some important propositions, moved by Dr. Peter Samways, to the archbishop for consideration. It appears also that in the *Preces Synodales*, first printed from the Acts by Canon Trevor,² the words '*in Eboracen. gentium*' were

¹ *Syn. Angl. App.* p. 76.

² *Two Convocations*, p. 104. This prayer was used *verbatim* in the Vatican Council of 1870. It is also found in Egbert's Pontifical (A.D. 760), where it may have been inserted in the thirteenth century: in any case it was clearly the standing synodal prayer of the Western Church, and must have been in use at Canterbury no less than at York. Archbishop Parker seems to have replaced it with the Latin Litany, and the prayer now in use which the registrar notes as 'noviter ut apparuit edita' (*Syn. Angl. App.* 198). Archbishop Longley was content to follow in English; but it is surprising that the Northern Convocation should still be insensible to the treasure preserved in their Acts, and one so infinitely superior to the modern substitute. As Dr. Trevor's book is out of print, we take leave to transcribe this venerable relic:—

'Adsumus Domine Sancte Spiritus! adsumus peccati quidem immanitate detenti atque deterriti, sed in nomine Christi specialiter convocati et congregati; Veni ad nos et esto nobiscum; dignare cordibus illabi nostris: Doce nos quid agamus, quid dicamus, et ostende quid efficere debeamus, ut Te auxiliante Tibi in omnibus complacere valeamus. Esto salus nostra omniumque in Te sperantium; esto effector et confirmator judiciorum nostrorum, omniumque servorum Tuorum vices Tuas ubique

altered to '*jam Londini*,' where the House deemed itself present by proxy. But though armed with full powers to consent or dissent, there is no probability that any of the York members sat or voted in the Lower House of Canterbury. They were '*procuratores, actores, factores, negotiorum nostrorum gestores, et nuntios speciales*,' but the object being only to affix the subscription of the House assembled in Synod at York, it is not to be imagined that they would go beyond the specific purpose of the power of attorney.

In here closing our historical review, it is important to observe that, with the exception of subsidies *gravamina* and contested elections, the synodical business was mainly transacted in the Upper House. The conclusions there arrived at were sent to the Lower House and passed for the most part *nemine discrepante*. If objection arose, it was reported by the Prolocutor and reconsidered in the Upper House. The Houses occasionally deliberated together in full Synod. A few divisions are on record; but there were no reporters and nothing like a modern debate. It was the Non-juring Secession, and the plot to tamper with the Liturgy, which, by destroying the confidence of the clergy in the episcopate, led to the scenes which brought about the suspension of Convocation, with the consequent weakness and disorganization of the Church.

We may now claim to have historically demonstrated the following positions:—

1. That the two Convocations are co-equal and co-ordinate Synods, each representing the National Church in its own province, and as incapable of amalgamation or fusion as the Synods of England and Ireland.
2. That their united action, whether concurrent or successive, constitutes the National Synod.
3. That concurrent action is no better guarantee of unity

prasertim in Eboracen. [*jam Londini*] gerentium. Præcipue autem in bonitate Tua memineris Domini nostri Caroli secundi, eorumque qui ei sunt a conciliis, tum ecclesiasticis tum civilibus, tum publicis tum privatis. Non sinas inter nos perturbatores esse justitiæ, Tu qui summam diligis æquitatem! Non in sinistrum nos ignorantia trahat, non favor inflectat, non acceptio munerum vel personarum corruptat: sed junge nos efficaciter Tibi solius Tuæ gratiæ dono, ut simus in unum, sed in nullo aberremus a vero; quatenus in nomine Tuo collecti sic in cunctis cum moderamine pietatis justitiam teneamus, ut hiis a Te in nullo dissentiat sententia nostra, et in futuro sæculo Te facie ad faciem in æternum beatifici videamus, Tecumque semper regnemus, per Christum Jesum Dominum et Salvatorem nostrum: Cui cum Patre benedicto in unitate Spiritus Sancti sit omnis honor dominium et gratiarum actio, in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

than successive, while the latter secures the fuller deliberation.

4. That, from the provincial constitution of the Lower House, neither Convocation can do any synodical act outside the province.

5. That in intersynodical action the ordinary course—whether under the Pope, the *Caput Supremum*, or the existing Royal Supremacy—is for the northern bishops to consult and agree with the Upper House of Canterbury, and to send their conclusions to the two Lower Houses, to be synodically ratified in the respective provinces.

6. That there is not, and never has been, any power in the Crown, the Archbishops, or the Convocations themselves, to alter these fundamental relations. Nothing short of an Act of Parliament can revolutionize the constitution of the National Church.

It remains to consider the demand for further and more definite united action which has arisen from the altered circumstances of the Church. It is perfectly natural that the need should have been first felt in the province of York, where the greatest alteration has taken place. The episcopate has been augmented from five—the number in the Northumbrian Church and not exceeded down to the Restoration—to ten, including Wakefield; and must be further augmented. The clergy have been multiplied probably three or four fold, and the population many degrees more. Socially and politically it has become the dominant section of the kingdom. It was not to be expected that the Convocation, with its larger representative element and the traditional superiority of the North, would be content with the very subordinate position assigned to it in the precedents of former ages. At its first meeting in 1861 they were confronted with a new canon (in substitution of Canon 29), discussed, agreed to, and formally promulgated by both Houses of Canterbury, to which they were desired to give their assent. The difficulty was increased by the absence of all the northern bishops from the deliberations of the Upper House of Canterbury. This omission was doubtless due to ignorance, but it cannot be justified. Archbishop Longley, the mildest of prelates (little foreseeing his coming change of position), expressed the feeling of his Synod in this way :—

‘It is right to mention that I have received from the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury an authorized copy of a new form of Canon to which that Convocation has agreed. I may also mention that that communication imposes upon us no obligation whatever. We are an entirely independent body, and act of our own accord.

The
inac
alter
can

The
of t
(Car
after
beth

to th
deba
with

pres
Nort
neces
Hou
woul
last
Long
tion,
catic
been

I
Hou
‘Tha
of ob
Conv
the o
of Pr
Chur
may

T
views
sugg
gama
of iss
pleas
prese
prese
Chur
voice

1 y
3 /

The Province of York can make any amendment, or may be perfectly inactive, as we please. We are at liberty to accept or reject the alterations made in the other Province. Nothing that is done there can impose upon us any obligation to proceed further than we please.¹

The result was that the canon stood over for the remainder of the primacy. The Lower House instructed its actuary (Canon Trevor) to examine the precedents, and his Report, after recapitulating all the precedents from the time of Elizabeth, concludes that—

‘There is no precedent of any law or formulary being proposed to the Convocation of York since the Reformation, which had been debated, concluded, and signed in the Convocation of Canterbury without reference to either House of this Province.’²

The Convocation of Canterbury hastened to explain, expressing their earnest desire to consider the opinion of the Northern Synod before proceeding to ask the Crown for the necessary powers to put the canon in use.³ The Lower House of York were desirous of proceeding, but the Bishops would only appoint a committee. When the canon was at last carried under the present Primate (1864), Archbishop Longley, then at Canterbury, applied for the Royal ratification, upon which Archbishop Thomson wrote that the application was made without his consent, and the canon has not been ratified to this hour!

In the course of these untoward proceedings, the Lower House of York resolved, after a very slender debate :

‘That this House is fully persuaded that the only satisfactory mode of obtaining that joint and harmonious action is the union of the two Convocations of York into one body, so that, without prejudice to the occasional assembling if need be, by the permission of the Crown, of Provincial Synods, that general Convocation of the clergy of the Church of England, which now consists of two Provincial Assemblies, may meet together in one National Synod.’

The resolution was supported by speakers of such different views as Dean Goode and Archdeacon Churton, but neither suggested any practical means of effecting the desired amalgamation. The resolution credits the Crown with the power of issuing a National or Provincial writ of Convocation at its pleasure. The speakers further assumed that in either case the present representation in the Lower House of York would be preserved. ‘The Convocation of Canterbury (said Archdeacon Churton) must take them of York as they were, and their voice would be more potent in union with the larger body

¹ *York Journal of Convocation*, p. 85.

² *Ibid.* pp. 124-130.

³ *Ibid.* p. 137.

than apart from it.'¹ This implies that the Crown should empower the Archbishop of Canterbury to summon the Archbishop of York and his whole Convocation to appear before himself at St. Paul's. This is a good deal more than the Windsor decree; it overrides the provincial limitations of the Lower House, which were too strong for Edward I. or the papal legate. But then why should the larger province take the smaller as it is, and not rather impose upon it the diocesan representation imposed on itself?

It is needless to pursue the subject. No sensible person can suppose that the Crown would be advised to exercise a power which as a matter of fact it has never yet exercised, without an Act of Parliament, and this is what none of our heroic reformers have yet asked for. Parliament might think of a simpler plan. It might abolish the archbishopric of York, as it abolished the archbishoprics of Tuam and Cashel, and endow two new sees out of the revenue. The fusion would then be complete, unless Parliament should take the opportunity to fuse the Lay House with the clerical, and oblige us with a National Synod of the latest democratical pattern.

We must note that the Upper House of York has not committed itself to any of these insoluble problems; it has never done more than appoint a committee, and we do not find that they ever reported.

The Lower House of York has returned to the question at intervals. The archbishop glanced at it in his opening address last year, expressing his readiness to give respectful obedience to an alteration of the Crown writ. We suspect his Grace would be the very first to challenge the Queen's power to subject him and his courts to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Lower House, however, resolved *nem. con.* :

'That this House is of opinion that in the present needs of the Church of England it is much to be desired that a National Synod, uniting from time to time the two Provincial Synods of Canterbury and York, should be convened; and begs humbly to thank his Grace the President for his address on this question, and with due submission requests that his Grace will take such action, or join with the President of the Convocation of Canterbury in taking such action, as may to him or to them seem good, in order to obtain the necessary authority from the Crown to convene the said National Synod.'

The mover, Archdeacon Watkins of Durham, quoted both archbishops and the Bishop of London in his favour. He

¹ *York Journal of Convocation*, p. 161.

said
the
proc
but
Hav
will
than
unpr
know
requ
Hou
is re
a wo
usag
the a
than
suffr
calm
requ
have
and
wher
I
of Y
its c
from
it fai
dang
hum
altog
desp
mem
help
the
hard
amor
want
The
of th
into
prove
conse
Conv

said that National Synods had constantly been held before the Reformation, cited the 139th Canon as an unanswerable proof of his argument, and affirmed that 'nothing was required but the Queen's writ, and it was not likely it would be refused.'¹ Having already disposed of the archdeacon's precedents, we will only remark that to our mind nothing is more certain than a refusal, if the primates were so rash as to make an unprecedented application. The Archbishop of Canterbury knows how often he has been refused the much more moderate request for power to make a canon for a reform of his Lower House, of which no one disputes the necessity. Meantime it is remarkable that, with all this passion for united action, not a word is said for the resumption of the true constitutional usage of united deliberation by the two Upper Houses. That the archbishop should choose to be first in the north, rather than second in the south, is intelligible enough, but why his suffragans do not fly from the hyperborean atmosphere to the calmer Olympus in Dean's Yard is to us inexplicable. They require neither royal writ nor archiepiscopal permission. They have only to leave their proxies to answer the citation at York, and the Great Northern will swiftly bring them to the haven where they would be.

It is impossible not to sympathize with the Lower House of York, beating its wings so pathetically against the bars of its cage. Partly from its distance from the capital, and partly from circumstances on which we have twice commented before,² it fails to maintain its place in the National Synod, and is in danger of being left in sterile isolation. The position is so humiliating that we hear threats of abandoning Convocation altogether unless it is speedily changed; this would be to despair of the republic. Our friends in the north must remember that, in Synods especially, Heaven helps those who help themselves. Of the gallant band who fought and won the battle of the revival only one or two now survive, and hardly receive due recognition. It cannot be denied that among those who reap the fruits of their victory many are wanting in the *seriousness* indispensable to synodal success. The constituencies show too little regard to the qualifications of the candidates; the elections are allowed to degenerate into party conflicts or coalitions as the case may be. Men of proved synodical ability are set aside for nonentities, and the consequence is that the large representation of the Northern Convocation has less weight and influence than the scant but

¹ *York Journal of Convocation*, 1886, p. 148.

² *C.Q.R.* October 1884, Art. ix.; January 1887, Art. x.

earnest modicum in the Jerusalem Chamber. It is not the archbishop's fault that the Northern Convocation is content to meet but once a year; that the bishops can only spare a couple of days, and that the clergy are eager to get away from the York hotels. Judging from the Reports, the archbishop gives more time and thought to Convocation than any other member. He speaks upon every question, interrupts other speakers, corrects their motions and amendments, and is always eager to guide the Synod to his own conclusion. If he were less combative and imperious, he would be Speaker, Chairman of Committees, and Leader of both Houses, all in one. As it is, he only leads the Opposition.

The Bishops, affecting a Lucretian indifference to the storm, have reduced the Upper House to a cipher.¹ The Lower, with plenty of courage and ability, lacks industry and persistence. It appoints committees and overcrowds them with members; but the attendance is lamentably scant, and Reports are few and feebly followed up.² Now, this committee work is the most valuable part of the labours in the southern province, and the northern clergy may rest assured that they will never enjoy their proper share in the councils of the Church till they rise above personal and party views, and emulate the serious appreciation of synodical work by which the Southern Convocation has earned its power. No reform of procedure can make up for constitutional apathy.

It is time to come to the practical propositions. The Archbishop of Canterbury has been understood to suggest a free conference of the two Convocations in both Houses. This implies no organic change, no royal writ, no submission of York to Canterbury. It only extends to the Lower Houses the ordinary course of intersynodical deliberation in the Upper Houses. The suggestion is simple, feasible, and effectual. The Conference would not be a Synod; it would debate, agree, and conclude, but the synodical Decree would follow in the respective provinces apart. This would afford opportunity for reconsidering conclusions arrived at by chance majorities. Where

¹ The majority is actually entered in the Division List, February 15, 1882, *Ayes 0, Noes 1*! The explanation is that the President and the Bishop of Manchester kept a house, when the others had gone, to enable the Bishop of Liverpool to defeat a large majority of the Lower House.

² In the Committee of Privileges, consisting of sixteen members, the attendance seldom exceeds six and sometimes sinks to three. When the Prolocutor nominated Canon Trevor on a committee to confer with the Canterbury Committee on the Relations of Church and State, the archbishop called attention to the 'balance of parties,' and two tame elephants were added to outvote the formidable animal.

the m
act w
that
only
inters
leave

T
doubt
cation
Lower
deleg
not s
the tv
of 16
its be
a blo
ship,
the A
own c
advan
Lastl
been
oroth
The t
in the
very
admit
doors
to rec

O
seems
be gla
memo
portun
two p
the C
and th
foot o
But th
the C
confor
rejecte
groun
from
the R

the mind of each province was clearly ascertained, the synodical act would be a matter of course. It is no small advantage that the experiment might be tried whenever and for as long only as might be desired. If combined, as it would be, with intersynodical committees on particular questions, it would leave nothing wanting to joint and harmonious action.

The Archbishop of York's plan is more complex and doubtful. It proposes a 'delegation' of the Northern Convocation, comprising all the Upper House and one half the Lower, with the President at its head, to meet either a similar delegation or the whole Convocation of Canterbury—we are not sure which—on such questions as may be determined by the two presidents. This scheme has no support in the proxy of 1661. It begins by depriving the Northern Convocation of its best distinction; it disfranchises half the Lower House at a blow. Next it perpetuates in the Conference the dual headship, which is the cause of all present want of harmony. If the Archbishop of York is to keep the delegation under his own direction, and within such limits as he may approve, the advantage of mutual discussion will be seriously curtailed. Lastly, the plan retains a demi-house at York, who, not having been at the Conference, will be ready to help the archbishop or other dissatisfied members to refuse the synodical ratification. The two Houses at York may jump at such crude proposals in their impatience of the 'ills they have.' But we should be very much surprised if the Convocation of Canterbury should admit such a thorn in its side. It is one thing to open one's doors to a party of friends and neighbours, and quite another to receive a Highland chief 'with his tail on.'

On the whole, the Archbishop of Canterbury's suggestion seems to meet all the requirements of the case, and we should be glad to see the experiment tried. It would be a fitting memorial of the Jubilee, in which her Majesty has taken opportunity to rectify a strange anomaly in the treatment of the two portions of the National Synod. Everybody knows that the Convocation of Canterbury, like the Houses of Parliament and the Universities, is privileged to carry its addresses to the foot of the throne and be received by her Majesty in person. But this privilege, strange to say, has till now been denied to the Convocation of York, though extended to several Non-conforming bodies. Archbishop Thomson's application was rejected by a Home Secretary not famous for courtesy, on the ground of want of precedent. The fact is that the only address from York on record was to Queen Anne on the occasion of the Royal Bounty, and it could not be shown how it was pre-

sented. Canon Trevor having discovered that it was received by the Queen in person, and answered from her own lips, brought the fact before the House last year, and it was unanimously resolved to request the President to apply to the Queen for a restoration of the privilege. We have reason to know that the subject came under her Majesty's notice in the newspapers, and the result was that by Royal command the Convocation attended at Windsor on July 6, and were admitted to the Presence with their Address. This is another proof of what may be done by steady persistence on established lines.

ART. VIII.—RELIGION IN IRELAND: PAST AND PRESENT.

1. *Ireland and the Celtic Church.* A History of Ireland from St. Patrick to the English Conquest in 1172. By GEORGE T. STOKES, D.D., Vicar of All Saints, Blackrock, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Trinity College, Dublin. (London, 1886.)
2. *The Reformed Church of Ireland (1537-1886).* By the Right Hon. J. T. BALL, LL.D., D.C.L. (London, 1886.)

THE disestablishment of the Irish Church and the social troubles which, to those who regard them from law-abiding England, look something very like a revolution, have not, strange to say, smitten the sufferers under these events with literary unproductiveness. On the contrary, the Irish contributions to literature have been more important during the period since disestablishment than during any previous seventeen years that we can remember; and Trinity College has lost all title to the name of the Silent Sister. Our business at present, however, is only with the department of Irish ecclesiastical history to which the books at the head of this article strictly belong.

These works form a most creditable contribution from the Irish Church to its country's history and to its own. And without anticipating what we have to say of the merits of each individually, we would point out one characteristic common to both, which is under the circumstances equally surprising and hopeful. We mean their extreme moderation

and fa
imagin
speak
the ot
which
These
both i
but th
than I
to the
those

Pe
politi
Her m
sons e
little i
They
prima
situati
remor
battle
that u
it is c
look t
place
them.
were u
cling.
can ab
bring
it will
this p
burde
of the
chequ
with a

TH
to the
Divini
the au
Attent
volunt
by pro
mingl
attrac

and fairness of statement. Neither of them aims at the imaginative eloquence which has often been found in the speaking and writing of Irishmen, but in neither of them, on the other hand, is there the slightest tinge of that exaggeration which has so frequently marred this richness of language. These Irish gentlemen we may be sure have suffered severely both in purse and in position from the late changes in Ireland; but they treat the history of the country with far less passion than Mr. Froude, who belongs neither to the persecutors nor to the persecuted—to whichever Irish party we may consider those terms respectively applicable.

Perhaps some of this moderation may be due to the political impotence into which the Irish Church has fallen. Her members must be conscious that there is no class of persons either in England or Ireland whose utterances matter so little in the struggle of 'the classes and the masses' as theirs. They can return but two Members to Parliament, and, this primary condition being wanting, their comments on the situation have no more practical effect upon events than the remonstrances of some peaceful clergyman in the midst of a battle. They have so much the less temptation to be unfair that unfairness in their case is of no use. But none the less it is of excellent augury that members of the Irish Church look this state of facts in the face and accept with dignity the place of non-combatant spectators which fate has assigned to them. It is a position very different from that to which they were used and to which a few of their brethren still hopelessly cling. It is not every one who when fighting has proved useless can abstain from scolding. But to those who can, time may bring a reward at last. If ever peace should come in Ireland, it will be a just source of pride for Irish Churchmen that in this period of distress her members were found to bear their burdens so patiently and say and do so little that was unworthy of their profession, and that her writers were able to view the chequered history of the past, full as it is of causes of offence, with a truthfulness so conspicuous as these authors display.

The work of Professor Stokes leads the way as referring to the earlier period. It consists of lectures delivered in the Divinity School of Trinity College, Dublin, in discharge of the author's functions as Professor of Ecclesiastical History. Attendance upon these lectures is not compulsory, and the voluntary system has certainly worked well in this instance by producing a style of teaching in which the profit is so mingled with pleasure that we do not wonder it has proved attractive to the class. At the same time genuine research

is never sacrificed to literary charm. Dr. Stokes has judged well in preserving the colloquial form of his lectures when preparing them for publication. We may meet with a carelessly written sentence here and there, and sometimes with a few unessential details of which we can scarcely feel absolutely sure. But these defects are a small price to pay for the completeness with which the book meets the well-known first requisite of books—that of being thoroughly readable. How great a merit this is in the present case will be known only to those who have perused some former writings upon the same subjects. Nothing can be more timely at present than such a work. The Saxon reader need not put it aside as concerning only a troublesome country of which he had rather never hear. His duty is to learn something about a land and a race on whose future he is deciding when he exercises his Parliamentary vote. And, apart from this practical question, the part played by Ireland in the history of Britain, and even of Europe, during the centuries from the fifth to the eighth was such that the English student who neglects it is setting aside an important portion of his own national annals. A more trustworthy or a pleasanter guide to the 'origins' of the Irish question than Professor Stokes he is not likely to find.

We suppose it is our duty to make some criticism. If so, we shall admit in Professor Stokes a certain want of elevation in relating lives of the most lofty devotion. It is to be confessed that he sometimes seems to introduce us to the great Irish saints in the style of that functionary to whom no man is a hero. We plead guilty to so much of weakness as to dislike being told of St. Patrick that 'the poor man's digestion was out of order, or he had fasted too much, and was much in the same state as Luther when he flung his ink-bottle at the devil, who was making faces at him across the table.' This is rationalizing after the example of Paulus. And we do not in the slightest degree believe that this theory gives a probable account of the flocks of demons in the form of black-birds which beset the saint. It appears to us obviously more likely that we have in the story a legendary embodiment in material form of the spiritual conflicts through which the saint, like all his brethren, and like his Master, was forced to go.¹

¹ See the Life by Tirechan in *Analecta Bollandiani*, tom. ii. p. 57, where (unless we suppose with the editor that something has dropped out of the text) the birds who hid the face of the sky seem to be the saints of Ireland, past, present, and future, whom God had sent to bless the land.

But
of sa
ideali
which
and r
has r
the ap
sing
peopl
And
him i
fessor
result
and v
it hac
the a
graph
a sen
world
in rej
to rep
spirit
has t
what
task s
equal
histor
which
such
of a
surpr
And
comp
D
Parlia
progr
ment
tingu
studie
the f
for w
had
future
for it
legal.

But indeed it is a very hard matter in relating the lives of saints to strike the mean between the reverence which idealizes them out of all historic credibility and the familiarity which leaves out the supernatural greatness of their character and retains but the mundane details. The Irish imagination has room for both treatments, and can at the same time adore the apostle of Ireland as a patron of superhuman power, and sing of him that he 'was a gentleman and came of decent people.' But such inconsistencies are not for the historian. And the question, What are you to do with the miracles? faces him in every attempt to relate the lives of the saints. Professor Stokes simply leaves all the miracles out; and the result is a genial narrative in which our interest never flags, and which realizes the whole story with its surroundings as if it had happened yesterday. But we have often thought that the abundance of miracles with which the mediæval biographer adorns his story are his simple method of expressing a sense that his hero's faith rendered him superior to the world. If we think ourselves justified (as no doubt we are) in rejecting the miracles considered as physical facts, we ought to replace the miraculous element in the story by a sustained spirituality such as may constantly remind the reader that he has to do with men whose work and thought was beyond what natural causes could have produced. And this is a task so difficult that even Montalembert did not find himself equal to it, and simply embodies the miracles in the story as historical in the sense of being representative of the way in which it was viewed by the ages that handed it down. But such a treatment we fear would hardly command the respect of a class of Protestant divinity students. We cannot be surprised that Professor Stokes has chosen the other extreme. And his work is so good that we feel little disposition to complain of it.

Dr. Ball is ex-Chancellor of Ireland. As Member of Parliament for Dublin University he fought the conquering progress of Irish disestablishment with an ability and judgment which was acknowledged on all sides. He was a distinguished civilian in the days when ecclesiastical law was studied as it is never likely to be studied by Irish lawyers in the future. And these antecedents fit him excellently well for writing the constitutional history of his Church. If he had not performed the task it is unlikely that any one in future times would have acquired the knowledge necessary for its discharge. Nor is the material of the book merely legal. The reader will be interested to find that this suc-

cessful public man displays a knowledge and interest in theology and kindred subjects which shows that they must have possessed an attraction for him through life. In style the work aims only at the eloquence of terse expression and clearness. We may sometimes wish for more vividness of personal presentation and richness of detail. But we are content to accept instead of these a judicial exposition of facts and principles in which moral judgments are not wanting, but are expressed as from the bench with perfect calmness and self-restraint.

We shall not attempt to epitomise the story of Irish Church history which these works relate. In truth they tell their tale as briefly as we could put it. Our aim shall be to note some of the characteristic principles which the history exemplifies and the lessons which are to be derived from it. There is an extraordinary contrast between the small and haphazard character of most events recorded in the Irish annals of Church or State and the uniformity of the social and ecclesiastical lessons which they display. Never was there a history in which that orderly development and progress by which churches and nations are made is more disturbed by human wilfulness and temporary accidents. Yet nowhere can we find a history in which the same moral agencies work with a uniformity—we had almost said more sad and dreary—and in which similar results from similar causes recur more obstinately from age to age.

Whatever shades, both of sorrow and of obscurity, hang over the past history of Ireland, there is one possession at all events which England must concede to her; that of a patron saint whose history is a genuine national example. Even if (with Bishop Milner) we reject Gibbon's audacious identification of St. George with an army contractor of indifferent reputation, we cannot compare the conquest of the dragon, either for historic certainty or for Christian edification, with the well-attested missionary history of St. Patrick or the deeply Christian faith which his simple writings disclose to us. Professor Stokes relates the well-known story and analyzes the documents with great skill and fairness, and, as we might expect from his good sense, keeps pretty clear of the controversial disputes which have been so often waged over the saint's grave.

The Irish Protestant, to whom asceticism is a mark of the beast, has triumphed nearly as much over the fact that St. Patrick was the son of a deacon and grandson of a priest, as

over
man
hims
succe
ascet
may
man
it, to
excel
place
tative
tanti
as P
that
life w
of cle
respo
unde
comf
socie
of ou
hood
of pr
Celti
of Ch
them
to re
Prote
of th
welco
God,
that
wicke
incre
neces
meet
reform
Marr
cares
hour
more
the I
repub
there

1 S

over the parallel fact that St. Peter was himself a married man. But when we regard the life which the saint chose for himself, and which afforded the type whereon that of his successors was moulded, we find in it the most undoubted ascetic colour. The worthy Calpurnius, father of the saint, may have united the characters of civic magnate and family man to that of ecclesiastic, and been, as Professor Stokes puts it, town councillor, cleric, and farmer all at once. But this excellent person would have found himself entirely out of place in his son's mission, and so would his modern representative, the clerical citizen and country gentleman of Protestantism. The ancient Irish Church was essentially monastic, as Professor Stokes justly records. What is to be said is that this organization of ecclesiastical work and this ideal of life were not adopted in obedience to any hard and fast rule of clerical celibacy like that which Hildebrand imposed, but in response to the calls and occasions of the times, listened to and understood by Christian men who were regardless of their own comfort and worldly interest. We can well understand that a society of men of the same spirit existing among the conditions of our times might admit the idea of marriage in the priesthood as in many cases well adapted to the better performance of priestly work. Indeed, married clergy existed of old in the Celtic churches both of Ireland and Wales.¹ But the principle of Christian self-denial—of asceticism if you will—which led them to refuse marriage for themselves, would still be present to refuse it in many a case in which it is now adopted. The Protestant clergyman of the present day atones for his denial of the sacramental nature of marriage by the emphatic welcome which he accords to it as a state of life allowed of God. He marries even when the state of his income is such that marriage in a layman similarly provided would be counted wickedly improvident. The discouragement of thoughtless increase of the population, as all social reformers know, is a necessary subject of social instruction in these times. But it meets no assistance from the example of the cleric of the reformed Church in Ireland—and may we not say in England? Marry he must, though he load himself thereby with family cares and anxieties which will force him in many an anxious hour of the future to realize St. Paul's warning, by caring more for the things of his household than for the things of the Lord. And the Church to which he belongs, in her repulsion from Rome, will approve his union, but will not therefore be the more disposed to endow him with the means

¹ See Warren, *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, pp. 13, 14.

of supporting and educating a family. It will not even contribute generously to funds which undertake some of the family burdens of an underpaid clergy. The Irish Synod of this year recommended such a fund to the members of the Church as a fit object of Jubilee offerings, but with very small success. Expedients of this kind are but poor ones at the best, adapted to perform for the clergy in a very inadequate way family duties which fathers ought to be able to perform for themselves. For a clergy whose incomes are, we fear, likely to be so small as those of the large body of the Irish, the true cure for the evil seems to be not to marry unless your work calls for it and your means permit it. And in this the Irish clergy would be simply adopting in a very mild and moderate form that determination to renounce earthly ties at the call of God, which was voluntarily displayed by that Church of St. Patrick which they claim to represent.

And this leads us to notice a characteristic of early Irish Church work very closely connected with its ascetic and monastic form, and which is not only capable of imitation in a modified degree in the present day, but must in our opinion be imitated if the Irish Church is to be as efficient as she might be. We mean the system of working a district from a centre at which many clergy live, instead of dividing its area among a number of isolated priests. Professor Stokes well maintains the superiority of the ancient method for missionary purposes. But it is in many places equally applicable to his own Church. The country parts of Ireland are at present cut up for Church purposes into a very large number of poorly endowed parishes, each with its incumbent. In some dioceses there are not more than one or two parishes sufficiently large to require, or sufficiently rich to afford, a curate. The consequence is that no opportunity exists for a young man to learn his work under an experienced pastor. Scarcely has he been ordained priest when some small incumbency is offered him, on which he settles down and marries before passing through any of that period of probation and apprenticeship which stands at the threshold of other professions, and which is surely more necessary for a guide of souls than for a lawyer or a doctor. How very much better would it be for the younger clergy, and how very much better for small parishes, if these were thrown together and worked from a common centre by an experienced rector with a staff of curates. It will be difficult, no doubt, to prevail upon parishes to surrender their separate existence. They prefer Home Rule, and had rather be worked inefficiently by their own parson than

well f
sure o
bents
the sy
be on
The r
Mand
passag
by the
with t
the di

Pa
Patric
dencie
them
their t
influe
not re
the Ir
with t
which
provin
met w
liness
class a
and gi
it is w
which
in the
that h
spire t
that t
incons
cared
less ap

An
his m
Stokes
has su
and a
devote
religio
form t
selves.
tion w

VOL

well from a neighbouring town. But if ever, under the pressure of necessity and through actual inability to pay incumbents of small parishes, or to find men willing to accept them, the system which we advocate should be introduced, it would be only a return to the idea of the ancient Irish Church. The reader will find in the interesting work of the Baron de Mandat Grancy called *Chez Paddy* (pp. 180 *sq.*) an instructive passage in which he shows that this system is actually worked by the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, and contrasts it with the other system as practised in France, very much to the disadvantage of the latter.

Part of the asceticism which tinged the Church of St. Patrick and St. Columba was due, no doubt, to the tendencies of the Celtic race working in the teachers to incline them this way, and in the flock to require this character in their teachers. Professor Stokes is commendably awake to the influence of national character on Church history; but we do not remember that he connects the extraordinary value which the Irish have displayed for ascetic forms of devotion and life with the disregard of personal comfort in their own habits which is so very conspicuous both for good and evil. The improving landlord in Ireland (would that he were more frequently met with) cannot induce his poor neighbours to care for cleanliness and nourishing fare, as the English of the corresponding class are so ready to do. Let him build them pretty cottages, and give them the opportunity of improving their way of life; it is well if he is not driven to despair by the constancy with which they return in the most literal sense to their wallowing in the mire. He desires earnestly, but, alas! too often in vain, that he could make them care more for themselves, and inspire them with Saxon self-respect and ambition. He sees that their low standard of personal comfort is by no means inconsistent with reckless self-indulgence, and that if they cared more for good clothes and good food they would be less apt to become the slaves of drink.

And a social reformer in Ireland with this experience in his mind might read with very little sympathy Professor Stokes's account of the persistence with which the anchorite has survived among the Irish, the object of universal reverence and appreciation. No wonder, he would say, that a dirty devotee shut up for life in a kind of pig-sty should be the religious ideal of such a race, for he embodies in a pronounced form the degraded plan of life which they prefer for themselves. He would be better content with an English population whose religious ideal consists of a well-fed and well-

housed rector with a wife and family, and who aim at similar comforts for themselves. We have not the least doubt that such a judgment would have its application not only to much of Irish asceticism, but to much of asceticism in general. There is no question that the desire after improvement in worldly comfort is a great means which the Almighty uses in advancing the condition of the race. And yet this is but one side of the picture. We are not of opinion that the well-to-do rector completes the Christian ideal, or that religious devotion and the finer qualities of the soul are likely to be best fostered among the flock who feed in the fat meadows where he guides them. If the Celt, in his idleness and dirt, is the despair of the social reformer, the Celt living content with food which the Saxon counts starvation may surely obtain some respect from a Christian. Mr. Matthew Arnold has taught us how ill the Celtic element can be spared from literature: it is the same with life. The failures of the Irish in the affairs of life are often the excesses of a power to invest earthly wretchedness with an ideal charm, which is in close alliance with Christianity. If the Saxon rightly claims the promise which godliness has of the life which now is, he is less quick to realize the life to come. And the form of religion which suits the one race does not suit the other. The Celt must have an ideal element embodied in his religion, and meeting him in his life, of which the Saxon is quite impatient. He will have it in grotesque forms as well as in noble ones; in the superstitions of Welsh Dissent or Irish Romanism, as well as in the fervour of devotion which meets us among both.

Professor Stokes with great justice notices the persistence of the Celtic character as displayed in the opposition of Irish monasticism to the progress of Roman ideas. This obstinate retention of habits is an undoubted characteristic of the race, and we must make our account to find it in every department, whether of earthly affairs or spiritual. It will show itself in opposition to the interests of the very people who display it, and, what may seem more strange, in opposition to their own perception of what their interest is. The Irish peasant is very quick and shrewd, and you will often find him as well able as you are to perceive the injury which political agitation inflicts on him, and the selfishness of the agitators. But after all he will give his vote (even if he does not fire his gun) on the side of his race and its leaders. When you notice this you will naturally say either that he has deceived you, or that he has been intimidated. Neither will be the truth. He has

not
nati
just
has
who
and
the
siste
of j
ratio
wor
rests
spite

it is
cont
com
is a
your
has
whil
inde
to, c
cour
may
true.
tione
and
to as
comm
from
tome
welc
Irela
have
Engl
retai
bitan
politi
are f
natio
the
mark
Patri
state

Oct.

not deceived you, but rather been driven by his natural and national self in a direction which his intellectual self cannot justify. And when it is said, as it is so often said, that he has been intimidated, the unanswerable rejoinder is to ask who are the persons that are able to intimidate a whole race, and on what does their power over it rest? The fact is that the national tradition, working by means of the Celtic persistence, gives the intimidation an inward power and a sense of justice and fitness in every Celtic mind, which trebles its rational effect, just as Julius Cæsar could quell a mutiny by a word or two which recalled the soldier's mind from his interests and desires to the habit of discipline which ruled him in spite of himself.

This Celtic persistence of type is the more strange because it is so separable from individual perseverance. When we contrast Englishmen with Irishmen there is no point in the comparison more generally recognized than this, that the one is a dogged and persevering personage, who perhaps catches your idea slowly and adopts it unwillingly, but when once it has got hold of him may be depended on to carry it out; while the other is a volatile being, quick in appreciation indeed, but not to be trusted to act on what he has assented to, or to carry on in permanence what he has begun. Of course, this characterisation admits of many exceptions, and may easily be exaggerated. But in the main we think it true. Yet the quality of perseverance which is thus apportioned in the individuals seems to be reversed in the races, and the Celtic character has ever shown itself more powerful to assimilate the Saxon to itself than he to resist. This is a commonplace in Irish history, and it considerably deducts from the truth of a statement which Lord Salisbury is accustomed to make, and which we suppose can be only half welcome to the class in Irish society which he befriends—that Ireland contains not one nation but two. The principle may have its truth as to some parts of the North of Ireland, where English or Scotch settlers are so thickly massed as to have retained their type. But in the rest of the island the inhabitants of every race, whatever be their descent, religion, or politics, and however they may desire to class themselves, are for good or for evil Irishmen, and will display their national qualities wherever they go. They have breathed the air and touched the soil, and cannot wash out the mark even if they wished. So it was with the saints, as Patrick and Columba; and so it is with the soldiers and statesmen, as Roberts and Dufferin. Born abroad but living

in Ireland, or born in Ireland but living abroad, they are Irishmen all.

The monastic character of Celtic Christianity came well in to strengthen this national persistence. It was quite natural that Irish monks, in defence of the religious habits which had been handed down to them, should be equal to resisting all the rest of the world. Spiritual work, it is certain, must be done upon fixed principles. The sceptics, the never-satisfied inquirers, may have their place in God's kingdom, and perform a work useful to the Church. But inquiry and doubt give their minds sufficient employment; active Christian work is not for them, unless it be of some kind of which even they cannot doubt the usefulness. The half-convinced Christian may feed the hungry and clothe the naked, but he will never propagate the faith which he himself imperfectly believes among those who do not believe it at all. Somewhere there must be a stop to doubting if we are ever to begin Christian work; somewhere our digging of foundations must cease if ever we are to commence the building. This is a principle of which the Church of Rome has made ample use. We believe that she stops digging the foundation at a very insufficient depth, and that the building is consequently insecure. But we can well understand why her prohibition of doubt has set free so much active energy among her members for the purposes of work.

Now monasticism stereotyped this principle. It enlisted a body of soldiers for whom from the day they accepted the rule there was to be no question of first principles, but only obedience. The rule was the foundation upon which each man was to build; the lever by which he was to uplift himself to heaven, and bear his part in God's work on earth. We can perfectly understand the power of such an institution in times which were adapted to it; and under fitting conditions, and with a rule which can be truly accepted by men and women of the time, there will be room and place for it as long as the Church lasts. But the work which communities under rule are adapted to do will never be the work of change. Their life is organized upon the basis of accepting a received order without appeal. And every day that they live under this order it becomes more and more impressed upon the mind as a kind of law of nature, alteration in which would overturn the first principles of life, and leave one at the mercy of the world. And if Rome has frequently availed herself of the instinctive and unreasoning fear of change, it has no less frequently been used against her. Adherence to the chair of Peter is only her particular way of putting the principle: not the only way.

Th
dog
ism
inqu
in a
forb

and
the
this
rule
of t
foun
carr
the
of C
dem
poin
add
rule
goo
wor
In t
cal

to b
hav
that
Prot
succ
hab
heir
cont
thin
out
upon
crat
thei
beco
gate
each
sion
and
conc

The whole Eastern Church defends itself against her by the dogged determination not to change: so does Mohammedanism. And even Protestantism itself, through the principle of inquiry, might seem to be of its essence, yet organizes itself in a generation or two into a form in which inquiry is as much forbidden as in Rome itself.

We need not, therefore, be at all surprised at the extreme and sometimes unreasoning resistance of Irish monasticism to the Roman habits and claims. This way of celebrating mass; this form of tonsure; this time of keeping Easter, was their rule. It was what they had accepted as part of the principles of their spiritual life. On this basis, and in this form, the founders of their society had converted whole races, and carried the Gospel through half Europe. Tell them not that the points are not of supreme importance, or that the majority of Christians are against them, or that St. Peter himself condemns them. The very raising of the question whether a point of obedience is great or small, the very attempt to adduce authority in opposition to anything contained in the rule, was something in itself inconsistent with the duty of a good monk. In the spirit of unquestioning obedience had the world with its potentates and its temptations been resisted. In the same power must they resist the claims of ecclesiastical authority itself.

When the Church of Ireland at the present day pretends to be the representative of a church in which the spirit we have been describing worked and fought, it is pretty plain that it ought to aim at displaying something more than mere Protestantism. If, indeed, it is satisfied with a formal and legal succession, it may cheerfully divest itself of all the religious habits of the Church to which it claims to succeed; just as the heir to some noble name is its legal heir, though his habits contradict the whole tradition of his family. But we do not think highly of noble personages who claim their rights without the spirit of their position. We expect them to improve upon the ancestral tradition; but they must not turn democrats or sacrifice the principles which justify the existence of their own order. And so, if the Irish Church is pleased to become a merely Protestant body, a self-constituted aggregate of persons who have happened to adopt similar opinions each to the other; it may indeed by formal episcopal succession and local habitation represent the Church of Patrick and Columba. But the less it says about a parentage which condemns its mental habits the better.

As Professor Stokes truly remarks, the Church of Patrick

and Columba was neither Roman nor Protestant. It gave the best proof that it was not Roman by excluding and resisting Rome for more centuries than the succeeding ones during which Rome reigned with undisputed sway. But this separation from Rome was maintained, not upon Protestant principles (except so far as any protest must be protestant), but upon Catholic. It called to its aid, not the bare rights of private judgment, not the individual struggle for liberty, or the simple testimony of Scripture explained by reason, or the natural restlessness under ancient laws and customs—but the authority of tradition, the sacredness of primitive habit, the claim of an ancient community to bind its members and restrain their preferences, the divine will that individual devotion is best fostered when it runs in channels cut for it from of old, and regulates its daily course in a spirit of constant reverence for the prescriptions of a divinely-founded Church. These are the principles on which the Irish Church was based. She held them, it may be, in a simpler and ruder form than that which our age requires. But Irish Protestantism, as such, holds them in no form at all, and has so much the less right to call itself the heir of the ancient Church of its country.

Professor Stokes enumerates in his preface certain departments of his subject which he has been obliged to omit. Of these we can well understand that Celtic art should remain for treatment by specialists; but we trust that the Professor may include in the new edition, which is sure to be called for, a chapter upon St. Brigid and the ministry of women in the early Irish Church. It is a subject of such great importance, both in a social and religious view of Celtic society, that the picture is incomplete without it. We cannot think that a publisher, who desires, in Dr. Stokes's words, 'a history which will interest the public,' could possibly wish on that ground the omission of a theme so exceedingly attractive as that of woman's work. Nor could any part of the field of view be named in which the present Church of Ireland fails more entirely to reproduce the methods of its ancient predecessor, or is in more urgent need of awakening and instruction, than in that which relates to female ministration. In this great department, so intimately concerning the sex which furnishes its most earnest adherents, and filling so large a space in every primitive church system, the Celtic among the rest, the reformed Church of Ireland has as yet done nothing whatever. No ecclesiastical organization of woman's ministry exists in her at all.

T
has on
in a v
the lea
before
might
is true
liturgi
Dr. S
uses o
we en
gives
Gallic
earlies
tain t
in wh
featur
made
ment
select
the C
a very
who r
the p
Illatio
giving
many
Gallic
of an
the fo
'M
these
which
transm
transla
by me
T
primi
missa
for a
Dises
1 T
on the
Gallic
p. 150.

The subject of liturgies is another which Professor Stokes has omitted. The want, as he himself reminds us, is supplied in a very large degree by the works of Mr. Warren and by the learned paper upon the Stowe missal read by Dr. McCarthy before the Royal Irish Academy. But we think the Professor might have given us an interesting chapter on the point. It is true that much remains to be discovered in the matter of liturgies; still, the information in his hands has enabled Dr. Stokes to convince himself that the Irish and Gallican uses of the fifth century were identical, a conclusion in which we entirely concur. This once granted, the work of Mabillon gives us a great amount of information upon the early Gallican liturgies, which we are safe in applying to the earliest Irish use, however difficult it may be for us to ascertain the exact period at which it gave way to the Roman, or in what regions the substitution obtained.¹ A prominent feature of this ancient form of liturgy was the extensive use made of Holy Scripture, since a lesson from the Old Testament was included as well as the epistle and gospel; and the selection of this Old Testament portion for the various days of the Christian year was so careful and intelligent as to give us a very high conception of the Scripture knowledge of those who made it, and of the instruction it was fitted to convey to the people. The *Contestatio* (called in the Mosarabic form *Illatio*) was a lengthened memorial in the form of a thanksgiving of the saint whose day was celebrated. And there is in many of the so-called 'collects after the mystery' in the old Gallican form clear indication of Eastern influence in the shape of an invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elements, as in the following instance:—

'May the eternal and co-operative Paraclete descend, O Lord, on these sacrifices of Thy benediction, that we may receive the oblation which we have offered to Thee of Thy fructifying earth by a heavenly transmutation through Thy sanctifying power, that the bread being translated into the Body and the wine into the Blood that may avail by merits which we have offered for our sins.'

These ancient records of the Eucharistic services of the primitive Irish Church before the jejune forms of the Roman missal were forced upon it would have afforded rich materials for a Catholic revision of the Prayer-Book on the part of the Disestablished Church of Ireland, had Catholic principles

¹ The Stowe Missal exhibits in the various alterations which appear on the face of the MS. a very curious record of the change from the Gallican to the Roman form. See Dr. McCarthy, *Trans. R.I.A.* 1886, p. 150.

been in the mind of that portion of her members who forced the question of revision upon her ; and no single provision in the arrangement of her worship could be named which would have involved a more effective protest against Rome than a return to the intense spirituality and intelligent devotion of the early Eucharistic forms. Perhaps in the distant future a time may come when learning and breadth of mind shall sufficiently prevail to render a revision of the Prayer-Book on true principles a possibility in Ireland.

Professor Stokes holds out to us the hope in the course of time of a sequel to his present volume which shall furnish the history of Ireland and its Church from the English Conquest to the Reformation. The sooner he is able to perform his promise the better pleased shall we be. Meanwhile, to turn from his volume to that of Dr. Ball is like reading one of those plays, such as *The Winter's Tale*, in which a long period is supposed to elapse between the acts. Time, the chorus, should come forward and speak a prologue in which the intervening events should be epitomized. And, indeed, the change which the intervening period has brought with it is not too great for dramatic propriety to leave unrepresented on the stage. To skip in English history the period from the Norman Conquest to the Tudors would be ridiculous. It would not be possible to trace the connexion between the scene on which the curtain had descended and that on which it rose. For the period thus omitted includes a constant progress, social and political, which changed the face of the land and the condition of its people. Two races left at enmity when the conquest was completed have been so thoroughly welded together that the qualities of each have passed into the national character, and form the complement each of the other. The people have been drilled and schooled into obedience to the law by a stern and rigid rule ; and when the lesson of obedience has been well learnt, they have begun by a movement spreading gradually downwards through the nobles to the commons to claim a share of self-government, and the first germs of English political liberty are sown. The peace and order of the land, though often disturbed, has been constant enough to encourage quiet industry and impress upon the general mind the habit of labour and the trust in its results. And the wars of the kingdom, though bloody and destructive, have not been waged for nothing, but have had their fruits, either in increasing the national territory or strengthening the national institutions, or at the least in fostering the national pride and self-confidence.

ing
falle
Irish
spor
exis
of th
best
had
cent
nors
perf
orde
anci
of w
been
At
itself
ceed
Wh
unit
ever
Gre
ther
Celt
mig
and
ther
inte
-opp
any
had
flue
grow
a p
Rom
by
urg
bett
eve
It r
kno
com
age
hav

No such advance has taken place within the corresponding period in Ireland. The act of the drama which it has fallen to Professor Stokes to write, traces the independent Irish Church from its beginning to its fall, and the corresponding history of the tribal form of social and political existence. He has shown us how the ecclesiastical instincts of the Irish missionaries organized their work in the form best adapted to the condition of the people with whom they had to deal, and connected their establishment with the tribal centres; while their bishops, instead of being territorial governors, were officials attached to these communities for the performance of the ecclesiastical functions belonging to their order. He has described to us the resistance which this ancient ecclesiastical system made to the more efficient one of which papal Rome was the centre, just as pagan Rome had been the propagator of political order through the world. At the same time the tribal system has struggled to develop itself into a kingdom, has seemed under Brian Boru to succeed, and fallen back into its old disunion after his death. Whether the Celtic race if left to itself would ever have united and constituted itself may be doubted. It is not every race that has proved able to make itself a nation. Greece reached as far as the constitution of the city, but there stopped. But whatever the innate capacities of the Celts for political self-formation, and whatever assistance might have been given them in the process by the diocesan and provincial form of ecclesiastical order established among them we cannot tell, for their self-development was rudely interfered with from without and deprived for ever of the opportunity of showing whether they could have effected any better progress towards order in the future than they had during the past. But we must not exaggerate the influence of the English conquest in hindering Irish political growth. For many centuries, during which Britain was a prey to constant wars and invasions on the part of Romans and Saxons, Ireland was left perfectly undisturbed by foreign foes. During those centuries, it might be plausibly urged, the Celtic race had its chance of self-organization—a better chance than any other people in Europe enjoyed, for even conquering Rome did not touch it. It did something. It reached that development of art and civilization which we know. But it did not constitute itself; and it must not complain that it has never had a chance, nor forget those ages of unexampled independence, because its later centuries have been so miserably disturbed. Its conquest was rather

the punishment for not having used its opportunities of self-constitution than the denial of such opportunities to it. Be this as it may, from the time that the Northmen formed their settlements in Ireland the Celtic race has never ceased to see within the land which it counted, and still counts, its own, a foreign race better armed, better disciplined, better ruled, better reinforced from without, and if not braver, more resolute and industrious and ambitious than itself. And throughout this whole period the foreign immigrant, while strong enough to interfere constantly with Celtic independence, to form settlements which could not be dislodged, and to maintain constant war and disturbance over a far wider area than that in which he could make order and peace, has never been strong enough, or at least sufficiently put forth his strength, to conquer the whole land, as the Romans conquered Gaul or Spain, or even as the Normans conquered England. There is, therefore, no such exceeding difference between the state of things at which Professor Stokes closes his volume and that on which Dr. Ball opens.

If we might recur to our theatrical illustration, we should say that the curtain drops upon an effective tableau. In the centre stands the papal legate, who confers the pall as the sign of Roman subjection upon the Irish archbishops. Around him are ranged both the Danish and the Irish warriors. But the Danes stand the closer to him as the earlier and stronger friends of papal dominion, who joined hands through Canterbury with Rome when the rest of Ireland was still independent.

In what are the conditions changed when we pass over four centuries to the eve of the Reformation? The Danes are indeed no longer there under that name. But it is only the difference between Northmen and Normans, for the ruling race which is centred in Danish Dublin is of the same blood and the same character as the founders of the city. Only, the Normans have brought their Saxon subjects with them—willing subjects now and as sharply distinguished as their masters from the Irish race, the enemy of both. The union so happily made between Norman and Saxon has never been effected between English and Celts. The English pale is larger than the Danish bounds, but fails as really as the Danish had done to cover the whole island or even to occupy the fringe of mountains round the coast in which the native race finds its refuge and stronghold. Like the Danish, the Norman power is in strict alliance with Rome. Under the authority of Rome it made its invasion to bring the Irish into

better
approv
that a
ruins o
answer
episcop
attache
to tell
siastica
subject
beyond
centuri
period
less ref
law. 4
selves,
them, v
the pen
Irish H
secular
posed t

It
Europe
had pro
tenance
to infrin
intense
by claim
mission
power
did inc
much o
of plac
earthlin
and me
be secu
caused
In the
was dis
spiritua
of offer
became
which l
Ireland
tended

better Roman obedience and the habits of life which Rome approves. What, then, has Rome been doing by means of that authority of hers, which she established upon the ruins of Irish independence? This is a difficult question to answer in detail. What the efficiency of the parochial and episcopal system was, and in what degree the people were attached to the faith, we have, so far as we know, but little to tell us. But we are sadly assured that neither the ecclesiastical nor the civil influences to which the Irish have been subjected have advanced their civilization or their happiness beyond the point which had been attained seven or eight centuries before. For all that we can see, they are at the period we speak of less organized in political constitution, less refined in manners and mode of life, and less obedient to law. A sad verdict; and whether less creditable to themselves, or to the government which has taken on itself to rule them, we shall not attempt to decide. But so we arrive at the period of the Reformation: a term of curious import in Irish history, since it denotes there a change due to the secular power, and in no wise to the people who were supposed to need to be reformed.

It was the thought of those great minds of mediæval Europe, who speak to us through the verse of Dante, that God had provided distinct and separate organizations for the maintenance of sacred and secular dominion in the world. The first to infringe the ordinance were the popes. We know with what intense earnestness the poet resisted the papal ambition, which by claiming both kingdoms for its own degraded its sacred mission while seeming to exalt it into the greatest secular power in Europe. The forces by which it maintained itself did indeed pretend to be religious, and in its vast dominion much of spiritual religion existed. But its pomp and pride of place, the weapon of persecution which it wielded, the earthliness of the objects for which it strove, and the formal and mercenary methods by which its promised benefits could be secured: all these characteristics of the papal monarchy caused it to assume at last a thoroughly secular aspect. In the times immediately preceding the Reformation it was distinguished from earthly monarchies not by greater spirituality, but by the more formidable nature of its weapons of offence. And if in Europe at large the Mediæval Church became more and more secular with time, it was not Ireland which knew it in a spiritual form. The English had invaded Ireland by a donation of the island from the Pope as its pretended secular owner; nor had the Papacy ever assumed a

more sympathetic or a more religious attitude towards the Irish race than this first step in their relations indicated.

The secularity of the framework of mediæval religion explains and very largely excuses the Erastianism which tinged the Reformation, and with which in England and Ireland it has been so constantly reproached. If the papal system had been spiritual or intellectual in its nature and its power; if it had fought its battles by appeals to reason and feeling, the reformers would be justly blamed for calling in the earthly prince with his armies and his laws to oppose it. But without doubting the duty of reason and faith to defy those that kill the body, they could not in the circumstances of the Reformation time secure a fair stage for themselves against a power which scrupled not to use on the vastest scale the forces of this world to suppress them. The secular prince was the only one who could meet the Papacy on its own chosen ground of force and violence. No wonder that the reformers called in his aid; we cannot conceive how they could have maintained themselves without it. They did not appeal to a secular power against a spiritual so much as set up one secular power against another.

But when the secular prince undertook to head his subjects in a revolt against the Papacy, and to proclaim himself their leader in religion as well as in life, he did so under great disadvantages. Though the Papacy was tyrannical and worldly, yet the system of which it was the head was linked by an infinite number of bonds to the habits and feelings of the people. It had grown and strengthened itself by means of popular religious feelings, some of them praiseworthy and some of them superstitious. Its worship was such as popular tendencies had made it, and what was prescribed or imposed was that which the experience of centuries had proved to be adapted to the hopes, fears, and desires of the people at large. How could the secular prince, when he assumed the seat from which he had thrust the Pope, expect to devise a system which should enlist the hearts and minds of the people as widely as that which was overthrown? He had to solve a difficult problem indeed. It was not merely how to destroy an ancient system by a war of negation and opposition, but how to replace it. Laws of belief and worship might indeed be devised, and obedience to them be compelled. But religion is a matter which concerns the intellect and the feelings, the affections and moral sympathies of a people, and in which external compulsion and external obedience are insufficient. And the problem had to be solved by the aid of counsellors

who, in
with a
to be
sympa

W
were, c
solved
in tha
of Eng
its pro
dom l
Papac
sign c
devised
to the
its hig
monar
tinged
in taki
might
splend
the ex
since t
never
the sa

But
of the
There
mind
friend
when
worsh
religio
might
been
land.
the E
its lea
expec
their
them
case,
judgm
which
which

who, if they were worldly, were therefore totally unfit to deal with a religious difficulty, and if they were religious were apt to be prejudiced in favour of peculiar views, and out of sympathy with the mass of the people.

When we consider what the difficulties of the situation were, our wonder is that they should have been so successfully solved by English statesmen and reformers as they were. Yet in that case many circumstances came to aid. The preaching of English reformers both before the Reformation and during its progress had had wide effects; the pride of a strong kingdom had been peculiarly offended by the pretensions of the Papacy, and had shown unwillingness to submit by many a sign during centuries past; the new system of worship was devised in the midst of the English people, with due regard to their habits and preferences; the kingly power was at its highest, and England was in complete sympathy with its monarchy; the realistic tendencies of the English mind so tinged its religion that it did not see the same contradiction in taking a king for its leader in sacred matters as other nations might have done, and it was confirmed in this view by the splendid developments of genius and power which followed upon the experiment. And yet, after all, the Church of England since the Reformation, grand though its achievements be, has never succeeded in enlisting the whole body of the people to the same degree as its mediæval predecessor.

But in Ireland, so far as regards the Celtic people, not one of these helps to the Reformation had any existence at all. There was no special grudge or cause of offence in the Irish mind against the Papacy, except that which consisted in its friendship for England, and this was effectually wiped out when it became England's bitterest foe. The Reformation worship was devised without the smallest sympathy for the religious wants and desires of a Celtic people, and proved, as might be expected, utterly unfit to attract them. There had been no preliminary reformation movement whatever in Ireland. The Irish people, instead of feeling any friendship for the English government such as might induce them to follow its lead, were disposed by the experience of centuries to expect that all changes would have the object of organizing their enemies against them rather than that of conciliating them or saving their souls. And if, as was doubtless the case, the Irish were too barbarous to frame any formal judgment on the Reformation movement, these were the views which they had good reason to take of it; the judgments which lay in germ and undeveloped in their quick, though

ill-informed, intelligence. Dr. Ball, as many another writer before him, records the monstrous direction that Irish clergy unable to read the new Prayer-Book in English should read it in Latin. But in truth this was but one indication of the complete want of sympathy with the Celtic race which guided the Irish Reformation. Had this particular point been otherwise ruled, we have very little doubt that the Irish would have been alienated from the Reformation by the other accompaniments which surrounded it. And even if the interval before the Pope began to interfere actively against it had been longer than was actually the case, he would have found no difficulty at any period in rousing the Celtic race in opposition to a system so little fitted to attract it, and introduced by means and men unlikely to recommend any change to its acceptance.

To wish that it had been otherwise is vain, for it is to wish that the whole relations of England and Ireland had been different from what they were; that Celts had been tractable, and Saxons sympathetic. It could not be. And yet (if our readers will bear with us in our folly) it would not seem so impossible to imagine that the Reformation which professed to be, and in some measure actually was, a return to vital Christianity, should have admonished politicians of their neglected duties to the Irish race rather than subjected itself to the worldly purposes of statecraft. A few Irish prelates and divines have from time to time taken this tone, and what a few did too late it is possible to imagine all doing in time. Had the reformed religion been presented to the Irish in a shape adapted to their acceptance there must, indeed, have been some surrender in points that many have deemed important. There must have been much more of external form and ritual. The priest must have been recognized as a real priest and not merely as a preacher. Death must not have been thought to sever the departed from our prayers. The great testimony of the Divine in human life which the Real Presence provides must not have been smothered in intellectual theory. The impulses of an excitable and imaginative people, living much in externals, must not have been reduced to the standard of devotion which sufficed for a reasoning race. And this would have implied what would have appeared to some an abatement of the full demands of reformation; to us, perhaps, they would have seemed enrichments of the Church which had far better have been retained for the sake of human nature at large and in obedience to the Gospel. But even if the concession had involved some loss, how

great
for h
of a
souls
over
tual
repa
much
to ha
She
spir
thes
Chur
woul
anoth
narro
brok
patte
temp
ever
amon
lot.

B
advan
the a
which

W
imag
care
in th
testar
to pu

B
have
which
which

T
tude
with
the la
from
guidi
it is s
altog
has th

great would have been the gain ! The Church would have had for her sphere of work a whole nation instead of a fragment of a nation. She would have been in contact with millions of souls sorely in want of her guidance instead of handing them over to those whom she deems blind guides. And any spiritual good she could have done among them would have been repaid by delivering her from the fatal possession of too much wealth and prosperity, while the multitude who ought to have been her children endured penury and persecution. She would have remained free from the infection of party spirit and race enmity. And not in Ireland alone would these benefits to the Reformed Church have come ; even the Church of England itself, as head of the Anglican communion, would have incalculably gained by including within its bounds another race besides the Anglo-Saxon. The insularity and narrowness with which she has been charged would have been broken through, her worship would not have been all of one pattern, nor her laws and customs framed to suit one national temper. She would have been more Catholic than she has ever been, and thereby better fitted for the work of missions among various races which has so wonderfully fallen to her lot.

But we shall be told that if the Church had made any advances of this sort towards the Irish, she would have lost the affections of Protestantism in the same ratio as that in which she gained the native race.

We reply that the dream we are dreaming includes the imagination that the English settlers in Ireland should care less for Protestantism than for Christianity. Indeed, in the case supposed, all Ireland would have been Protestant, or none of it Protestant, whichever way you choose to put it.

But we shall be told that the native race would never have accepted any religion, even were it that of Rome itself, which did not take its side in the political and social contest which it had to wage with the usurpers of its fields.

This is, perhaps, true, and may explain the present attitude of the Church of Rome in Ireland. She believes, and with reason, that if she admonished the Irish of their duty to the landlord and the law they might withdraw their affections from her. And she follows the popular impulses instead of guiding them. We see and blame her moral defects ; but it is scarcely for us who have missed our hold of the people altogether to criticize her very sharply. She is in power ; she has the spiritual constituencies. We are in Ireland only an

opposition; yet an opposition may have its functions even though unable to become a ministry.

Our limits do not permit us to follow Dr. Ball into the period subsequent to disestablishment. And, in truth, we do not consider this the most satisfactory portion of his work. Perhaps it is because the contests in the Church of Ireland which followed upon disestablishment are fresh in our minds that the bare record of the statutes passed by the synod appear to us so lifeless a record of a history, most of which indeed had better be permitted to die, but which still conveys some useful lessons. For then the stored-up Puritanism of many generations of Protestant supremacy attempted to reconstruct a branch of the Catholic Church, and only succeeded in proving in the face of the world how ill fitted it was for any such task. And surely Dr. Ball is wrong in representing the Oxford movement as utterly without influence in Ireland. That its influence was not widely extended we allow; would that we could deny it. But it enlisted some remarkable men even in Ireland, not to mention the Irish men and Irish women who helped the Church movement in England itself. Dr. Ball has named among the writers of Ireland the lamented Archer Butler, a decided Churchman, who, had he lived, would have played an important part. He might also have mentioned the little knot of accomplished men who surrounded the late Lord Dunraven, and whose secession to Rome did sore harm to the cause of Irish churchmanship; while of those who remained staunch there were among others Todd, Boyton, the Woodwards, and the patriarch of Irish Churchmen, Dr. Maturin, who has, amid universal respect and regret, departed to his rest in this very year, having testified for half a century to unsympathizing ears, and lived to see his principles progressing with a measure of success which is, at all events, greater than he could ever have expected in his earlier days.

How far the Irish Church has it in her power to repair any of the neglects and heal any of the wounds of past ages it is not for any of us to say. Let her work in faith, leaving the issue to God. For many a year to come her best way of doing good to the nation at large will be to improve herself; so that the aspect she presents to the people may not be that of a sect but of a church. Let her not spend her time in protesting; let her eschew new inventions in doctrine and devotion; let her teaching be positive and Catholic, her worship constant and as beautiful as she can make it, her attitude towards all political movements and interests impartial and dignified, her witness to God's moral law unbiassed by favour

or in
circu
that
that
mine

Al

1. V

2. F

3. T

It w
Man
tion v
durin
find
light
itself
centu
for it
art, b
has b
with
there
to the
bition
exert
trust
tive a
been
draw
T
could
VO

or interest, her learning genuine and superior to the passing circumstances of the time. And we must in fairness pronounce that the authors now before us have written as men who felt that such an attitude became their Church, and were determined to assist her in assuming it.

ART. IX.—FIFTY YEARS OF ENGLISH ART.

1. *Victorian Fine Art.* By WALTER ARMSTRONG. *Art Journal*, Jubilee Number. (London, 1887.)
2. *Fifty Years of British Art, as illustrated by the Pictures and Drawings in the Manchester Royal Jubilee Exhibition*, 1887. By J. E. HODGSON, R.A., Professor of Painting in the Royal Academy. (London, 1887.)
3. *The English School of Painting.* By ERNEST CHESNEAU. Translated by L. N. ETHERINGTON, with a Preface by Professor RUSKIN. (London, 1885.)

It was a happy inspiration which prompted the citizens of Manchester to celebrate the Queen's Jubilee by an Exhibition which should illustrate the progress of Art and Science during her fifty years' reign. Nowhere in England do we find Art cultivated and artists encouraged in a more enlightened and understanding spirit than in this great city, in itself one of the most remarkable products of the present century. Not only has the Corporation been distinguished for its liberal purchase of the masterpieces of contemporary art, but for some years past one of our best living painters has been employed to decorate the Town Hall of Manchester with a series of frescoes illustrating the civic history. It was, therefore, only natural that special attention should be devoted to the Fine Arts department of the Manchester Jubilee Exhibition, and the most complete success has attended the exertions of the committee to whom this section was entrusted. Perhaps never before has so thoroughly representative a collection of the works of art belonging to any period been brought together as this one of the paintings and drawings of the Victorian age at Manchester.

The opportunity was a splendid one for the student, who could thus cast his eyes backward over the last fifty years,

and compare the works of men whose now half-forgotten names cast lustre on the early days of the Queen's reign with the latest achievements of living painters, which were the boast of last year's Academy. Each successive phase of art, every movement which has taken place during this memorable period, was here fully represented. The works of masters who have stood apart from the crowd, and painted in silence and solitude, were seen here as well as those of the popular favourites with which we are all familiar. For the first time pictures by Dante Rossetti and Madox Brown hung side by side with works by Leighton and Millais, by Orchardson and Tadéma, and the respective merits and distinguishing tendencies of their painters were clearly brought to light.

An exhibition so varied and so admirably arranged, so complete and representative in its character, could not fail to be profoundly interesting. Many were the reflections it suggested, many the problems which it forced upon our consideration. Does Art progress to-day? we ask ourselves. Has it reached a higher level than it had when Queen Victoria ascended the throne? Do we see here any advance in painting which at all corresponds to the marvellous development of science and material prosperity which England has witnessed during these last fifty years? Above all, does the art we see here worthily represent the culture and learning, the passions and aspirations of this great Victorian age?

Let us take a rapid glance at the chief features of the fifty years' art which is here brought before us, and, with the help of the critics whose writings stand at the head of the page, see how we can best answer questions such as those which the Manchester Exhibition naturally suggested. The critical essay on Victorian Fine Art which heads our list appeared in the Jubilee number of the *Art Journal*, and is the work of Mr. Walter Armstrong, a writer already known to most of our readers by his papers on the National Gallery, which originally appeared in the *Guardian*. In these, as in other contributions to periodical literature, Mr. Armstrong has proved himself a competent critic, and his judgments cannot fail to command respect even where we may differ from his conclusions. His present sketch of Victorian art is powerful and comprehensive, and he gives a lucid and interesting account of the different schools or movements into which the painting of this period may be divided. Here and there, it seems to us, his keen appreciation of technical merits is apt to blind his eyes to higher excellence, and while he invariably endeavours to be fair in his criticism it is plain

that
mas
nati
Hol
in d
is in
that
and
Hur
abov
path
Wal
Mas
at M

Roy
illus
Exh
but
judg
larg
the
righ
Mar
one
mat
alto
to s
conv
pict
may
we a
the
pers
stir
turv
wor
185

of s
ture
a w
inte
fore
in j

that he has but little sympathy with those contemporary masters who devote themselves to the higher forms of imaginative art. The 'painted poetry' of Rossetti, of Watts, or of Holman Hunt has apparently but few attractions for him, and in dwelling on technical faults and defects of their work he is inclined to forget the poetic intention and nobleness of aim that inspired them. In the same way the art of Orchardson and Tadéma is more congenial to him than that of Holman Hunt or Burne Jones. He ranks Millais and Frank Holl above Watts as portrait painters, writes with greater sympathy of the Scotch landscape painters than of Frederick Walker and his followers, and leaves out all mention of George Mason, whose fine group of works attracted general attention at Manchester.

The pamphlet in which the Professor of Painting in the Royal Academy discourses of Fifty Years of British Art, as illustrated by the Pictures and Drawings of the Manchester Exhibition, offers a curious contrast to Mr. Armstrong's brief but able and well-written summary of Victorian Art. To judge from this specimen of his powers, Mr. Hodgson is not largely gifted with the critical faculty. He leaves to others the invidious game of finding fault, and distributes his praises right and left with lavish hand. He finds Long's Babylonian Marriage Market 'delicious,' and pronounces Goodall to be one of the ablest and Joseph Clark one of the most consummate of living artists. Rossetti alone he frankly confesses is altogether beyond him; he tells us 'it is brain-splitting work to study him,' and that 'his drawings fatigue the mind and convey no meaning' (p. 46). Mr. Hodgson's notes on the pictures contained in the thirteen galleries at Manchester may be of use to visitors to the Exhibition, but on the whole we are inclined to think the parts of his book likely to prove the most valuable are those portions in which he gives his personal recollections of artists, or his reminiscences of the stir caused in artistic circles, and what he calls 'the topsyturveyism of old associations' which he found in the art world on his return to England after some years' absence in 1852.

If the last-named book is decidedly tinged with the flavour of self-congratulation common to much of our Jubilee literature, M. Chesneau's history of English painting will serve as a wholesome corrective in this respect. It is both useful and interesting to hear English art and artists judged from a foreign point of view, 'to see ourselves as others see us,' and in justice to the French critic it must be said that he has

devoted much time to the study of that side of English painting which is in direct opposition to French views of art, and has endeavoured with praiseworthy zeal and patience to enter into the meaning of English pictures and understand the aims that have inspired our finest national art. The book is, in fact, to quote the words of the preface with which Mr. Ruskin has honoured M. Chesneau's volume, 'a piece of entirely candid, intimately searching, and delicately intelligent French criticism.'

Faults it undoubtedly has, as Mr. Ruskin also points out. The author is 'too ready to forgive the transgressions of minor genius, and to waste his own and the reader's time in the search for beauties of small account and the descriptions of accidental and evanescent fancy.'¹ He gives elaborate descriptions of pictures by such little-known pre-Raphaelites as Arthur Hughes and W. H. Fisk, and devotes five or six pages to Sir Noel Paton, while he has scarcely one to give to Walker or Rossetti. The achievements of several of our most illustrious masters have to be crowded into a single paragraph for want of space; others, such as W. B. Richmond and Dyce, are not mentioned at all; and not a word is said of our modern school of portrait painting, one of the most remarkable developments of Victorian art. But, putting aside this want of proportion, which makes itself felt throughout M. Chesneau's work, his acute perception and the soundness and independence of his judgments render his book a valuable one and deserve the high praise which it has received from Mr. Ruskin.

The French critic divides the history of English painting into two periods, and dates the rise of the modern school from the year 1850—that is to say, the moment of the pre-Raphaelite revolt. Up to this time he considers painting in England—with the exception of landscape art—to have been clever indeed, and at times original, but altogether wanting in genius. And certainly it must be confessed that during the early years of the Queen's reign oil painting sank to a very low ebb. Constable had died in 1837, and although Turner lived till 1851 his best work was done. Most of the other painters whose names stood highest in public opinion, Etty and Stanfield, Mulready and Leslie, belonged to what M. Chesneau calls our 'ancienne école,' and were survivals from the Georgian age. Their ideals were those of another day, and, with the exception of Stanfield, whose 'Tilbury Fort,'

¹ Preface, p. x.

the
1844
repu
tions
C. W
rece
genr
rare
gite
colle
prof
leng
Wes
attai
bran
of a
lecti
devo
nity
lish
reign

of t
Egy
Mul
delic
by s
Sam
land
Fiel
whic
lusc
in o
and
"Ri
suns
nob
Cas
the
stru
Fou
lark
toge
may
Dav

the best example of his style at Manchester, was exhibited in 1844, they had already painted the pictures which made their reputation, and were content with repeating former conceptions with more or less variety. Such artists as Maclise, C. W. Cope, and E. M. Ward, who lived until comparatively recent years, served but to prolong the old style of historical genre painting in a feeble manner, and, except in one or two rare instances, did not rise above mediocrity. A far more gifted master, William Dyce, whose best easel pictures are collected in the present Exhibition, was forced to give up his profession for years for want of patronage, and when he at length found a fair field for his powers in the frescoes of Westminster Palace it was too late in the day for him to attain the high place his genius might have won. The one branch of painting which flourished in this stagnant condition of art was water colour, and those who saw the splendid collection of drawings brought together in the three galleries devoted to water colours at Manchester had ample opportunity of seeing the high excellence which this peculiarly English form of art reached in the first years of Queen Victoria's reign.

Wonderful indeed in its skill and variety was the display of talent which met us there. Eastern scenes, Moorish and Egyptian streets and markets, by John Lewis and William Müller; ruined abbeys and cathedral portals, drawn with delicate grace and lightness by Prout and Roberts, hung side by side with ripening harvest fields and gorgeous sunsets by Samuel Palmer and John Linnell. There, too, were Arcadian landscapes by Barret and De Wint, breezy downs by Copley Fielding, and fruit and flower pieces by William Hunt in which ripe plums, quinces, and apples glow with colours as luscious, and under a sunlight as bright, as any now growing in our English orchards. And there, too, finer still in colour and poetic charm, were the well-known Turners, the two 'Righis,' one misty blue, the other flushed with rose-red sunset hues, prominent among them; and, finest of all, the noble group of David Cox's landscapes, including 'Beeston Castle' and the 'Welsh Funeral,' two splendid specimens of the mountain scenery he loved best and those effects of struggling clouds and sunshine which he loved to paint. Fourteen of his finest oil paintings, amongst others the 'Sky-lark,' 'Rhyl Sands,' and 'Bettwys Churchyard,' were grouped together in another gallery, so that the Manchester Exhibition may fairly claim to have contained the best collection of David Cox's works that has ever been brought together. For,

although born as far back in the last century as 1783, David Cox only died in 1859, and it was in the last twenty years of his life that he developed his greatest powers and strongest individuality, so that he belongs of right to the painters of the Victorian age, among whom he takes high place. Mr. Armstrong goes so far as to say that in point of pure art he excelled Turner. 'No finer art,' he goes on to say, 'than that of Cox at his best exists. It has the poetry of Corot without his mannerism, the truth of Constable without his want of style' (p. 167).

Certainly no one has painted the fleeting effects of our changeable English weather, the special beauty of our English scenery, the showery skies and windy hillside, the green meadows and hedgerows, the yellow cornfields and far blue plains, with greater faithfulness and more genuine delight in his task; and it is because these familiar sights and scenes appeal to us all that his work has met with so wide a response and his influence has been so largely felt by succeeding generations of artists.

It is singular that at a moment when so much true poetic feeling was to be found among our water-colour artists a more and more prosaic spirit seemed to pervade the art of oil painting. No subject was held too commonplace or trivial to be represented as long as it was treated after the usual conventional fashion and lacquered over with a thin gloss of sentiment. Thus it came to pass that even bustling stations and crowded racecourses were considered appropriate pictorial themes, and Frith made his reputation by his 'Derby Day' and 'Railway Station,' which M. Chesneau calls, not without reason, 'the worst painting that can be imagined.' The one artist who stood higher still than Frith in popular estimation was Landseer, who was knighted in 1850 by the Queen, and whose career, from the time when, as yet a boy, he exhibited his first picture in the Royal Academy until his death in 1873, was one long course of easily won successes. In spite of his many defects as an artist, in spite of what Mr. Hunt justly calls 'the pomatunmy texture of his painting, the absence of firm bone beneath the skins, and general melting away of every form into shapeless cloud,' his popularity is still great at the present time, and it is a curious fact that one of his works, 'The Spearing of the Otter,' was insured for the enormous sum of 7,500*l.*, the highest price set upon any picture in the Manchester Exhibition. Probably the chief secret of his extraordinary success is owing to what M. Chesneau calls his clever trick of giving animals a human expression, a look

of into
and I
in Pa
pictur
But i
were
from
work
in th
teach
Holm
Milla
Order
posec
singl
and
avers
coun
the I
I
its s
hum
sent
was
minu
whic
S
the t
a thi
and,
them
spiri
in th
Urbi
calle
the
unio
hoo
pain
the
setti
by e
the
mov
have

of intelligence which does not belong to them. Both Landseer and Frith were among the masters whose works were exhibited in Paris in the year 1855, when for the first time English pictures attracted considerable attention in French circles. But in that same Exhibition of the Avenue Montaigne there were some paintings of a new and wholly different character from anything that had yet been seen in Victorian art, the work of a little band of young men who had joined together in the noble but visionary dream of regenerating art by their teaching and practice. These pictures were first and foremost: Holman Hunt's 'Light of the World,' and three others by Millais, 'Ophelia,' 'The Dove's Return to the Ark,' and 'The Order of Release.' Although these works were directly opposed to French views of art in their mode of treatment, their singularity and originality could not fail to command attention, and M. Chesneau describes amusingly the mingled feelings of aversion and fascination with which they were regarded by his countrymen, sentiments which were by no means confined to the Parisian world.

Here was an art which formed a startling contrast to its surroundings, which had nothing in common with the humorous style of genre painting or the melodramatic representations of historical events then in vogue, an art which was serious, earnest, above all original; an art in which the minutest details were reproduced with faithful accuracy, but which was all the same inspired by the noblest ideal feeling.

Six years before the Exhibition of the Avenue Montaigne, the two young artists who painted these pictures joined with a third, Dante Rossetti, the master spirit of the little band, and, fired with enthusiasm for the art of the old Italians, bound themselves to work together in the same humble and patient spirit, with the same patient zeal for truth, the same firm faith in the lofty mission of Art. And, since the name of the great Urbinate was made to cover all conventional modern art, they called themselves the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood, and signed the letters P. R. B. on their pictures as the mark of their union. Four other young men afterwards joined the brotherhood. Two of them, F. G. Stephens and James Collinson, were painters; one, Thomas Woolner, was a sculptor and poet, and the seventh, Dante Rossetti's brother, William Michael Rossetti, the distinguished writer and critic, who began his career by expounding the principles and defending the practice of the new school. Several other men who sympathized in the movement, such as William Bell Scott and Ford Madox Brown, have been spoken of as Pre-Raphaelites, but were never mem-

bers of the brotherhood, which remained limited to the original seven.

So in the year 1849 the new movement was set on foot, a movement which Mr. Armstrong, who cannot be accused of undue partiality to the pre-Raphaelites, calls the most important that has ever taken place in English art.

'The times were ripe for it, and, indeed, it was no more than the art branch of the great uprising against lethargy and conventionality, which seems to have been set afoot, in the first instance, by the mechanical progress made in the long peace after Waterloo. The enormous activities, both of brain and body, which had been called out in the struggle against Napoleon were diverted after his fall into more peaceful channels. With such events behind them as the French Revolution, the subjugation of Europe, and our own final triumphs by sea and land, men could not sink back into the sloth of the eighteenth century. They turned their minds to innovation in science, politics, commerce, literature, and religion. Each of these had their revolution, and Art had to have hers. That in some way this last revolution should be founded on error was inevitable, for revolutions are only made by very young men, and art, as a whole, is too complex for their grasp' (p. 170).

What, then, was the aim of the pre-Raphaelites when they set themselves to reform English art?

'Speaking broadly,' continues Mr. Armstrong, 'it may, I think, be said that pre-Raphaelism first enforced the principle that all art that deals with nature must speak through Truth' (p. 171).

And M. Chesneau's explanation is given in much the same terms.

'Its theory is governed by two ideas: a hatred of forms, appearances, and pretences, and a noble, passionate love of Truth' (p. 195).

'Truth, in fact,' to quote a noble passage from Mr. Ruskin, whom M. Chesneau calls the apostle of the movement, 'Truth is the vital power of the whole school; Truth its armour, Truth its war-word.' And in another place he writes thus of the central idea of the pre-Raphaelite school:

'Its mental power consisted in discerning what was lovely in present nature, and in pure moral emotion concerning it; its physical power, in an intense veracity of direct realization to the eye. . . . This fraternal link the reader will, if careful in reflection, discover to be an effort to represent, so far as in these youths lay, either the choice or the power, things as they are, or were, or may be, instead of, according to the practice of their instructors and the wishes of the public, things as they are *not*, never were, and never can be; this effort being founded deeply on a conviction that it is at first better,

and finally more pleasing, for human minds to contemplate things as they are than as they are not. . . . The works of these young men contained, and even nailed to the Academy gates, a kind of Lutheran challenge to the then accepted teachers in all European schools of art; perhaps a little too shrill and petulant in the tone of it, but yet curiously resolute and steady in its triple fraternity, as of William of Burglen with his "Melchthal" and Stauffacher in the Grütli meadow, not wholly to be scorned by even the knightliest powers of the past.¹

This protest against bad work and conventional art, this earnest effort to express with the utmost sincerity and completeness the idea which lay at the root of the painter's conception, was the great message these men had to give, and which, so far as it was possible 'in a time of trouble and rebuke,' they gave the world bravely and faithfully. If, in the ardour of youth and the warmth of their indignation against artificial sentiment and conventional rules, they sometimes carried their theories too far and exaggerated the very truths they had to tell, it is rather to be wondered they did not fall into graver mistakes and run into more violent extremes.

This is not the place to tell the fate which befell the movement, the curiosity with which their pictures were at first regarded, and the fierce indignation into which that sentiment soon passed, an indignation, Mr. Ruskin says, 'that caused the youthfully didactic society to be regarded with various degrees of contempt, passing into anger, as of offended personal dignity, and embittered further among certain classes of persons even into a kind of instinctive abhorrence,' until their work was denounced as atrocious and they themselves were brought to the verge of ruin and starvation. The tale of that fight for art has been already told, and a sorrowful record it is of the way in which England, for all her boasted civilization, has treated her greatest artists.

Time has justified the sincerity of their aims and the excellence of their work; their pictures sell to-day for as many pounds as they asked shillings, and the papers which were loudest in their denunciation pour out eloquent rhapsodies in their praise. Last year witnessed their final triumph at the Graham sale, following as it did on the Millais and Holman Hunt exhibitions, when the finest collection of pre-Raphaelite pictures ever known was on view at Christie's, and all London flocked to see these once despised and abused pictures. And this year the Manchester Exhibition afforded us another proof of the great and permanent influence which the pre-Raphaelite movement has had upon English art. If these men did not

¹ *The Colours of Pre-Raphaelitism.*

convert the world to their ideas they certainly left their mark on their generation, and it is not too much to say that all the finest art of the last thirty years has been largely influenced, where it has not been actually inspired, by their example.

Of the three original pre-Raphaelite painters, Dante Rossetti's art was the most completely represented at Manchester. The number of his works exhibited was small, but they included such characteristic examples as his smaller 'Dante's Dream,' 'Beata Beatrix,' the 'Beloved,' 'Proserpina,' the 'Blessed Damsel,' and the lovely little grey-green picture known as 'Il Ramoscello,' besides several of his finest water-colour drawings. We see him at his best in these subjects, that were inspired by the *Vita Nuova* of Dante, in whose age he seemed as it were to live, and which supplied him with most of his noblest conceptions, whether finished pictures or drawings glowing with colours as rich and jewel-like in radiance as the hues of stained-glass windows or the illuminated missals of mediæval times. Such, for instance, is the fine triptych of Francesca da Rimini. On one side we see the lovers as they were 'nel tempo felice,' and on the other, still clasped in each other's arms, as they are whirled together in the furious blast of hell, while Dante and Virgil stand in the centre, their hands locked fast together in a passion of grief and pity. Such, again, is the meeting of Dante and Beatrice in the flowery meads of Paradise, where she turns suddenly and lifts her veil, and he gazes once more on the adored face—

'Guarda mi ben, ben son, ben son Beatrice'—

and in the background a bright troop of rose-crowned angels come running in behind her, striking their harps for joy. And we see him in those later days of waning powers and weakened intellect, when faults and mannerisms had crept in, and the hard curves of his lips and the livid shadows of his flesh painting had become positively ugly. But all through we feel the intensity of the man's individuality, the power of the imagination which lays its spell upon us and bears us away into an enchanted world of its own, a realm where unknown flowers spring up in the grass and strange sweet music fills the air. There can be no doubt that this poet painter was what Mr. Ruskin calls him, 'the chief intellectual force in the establishment of the modern romantic school in England;' more than this, 'the first on the list of men who have raised and changed the spirit of modern art.'

There is, however, one phase of Rossetti's art which we looked for in vain at Manchester, the drawings—for, alas! he

never
our
of M
phas
geni
men
life
agai
truth
desir
thes
not
so fa
that
spiri
rests
used
its hi
V
Pales
desol
and
anim
and p
his g
work
of the
turne
on H
paint
Man
lands
which
Engl
to see
still h
princi
recent
as po
can no
brothe
season
and ch
Th
works

never worked them into pictures—which deal with the life of our Lord, and more especially the 'Magdalene at the Feast of Levi' and the 'Virgin in the House of St. John.' This phase of art, which Rossetti touched with that originality of genius which marked all his work, received its fullest development in the hands of Mr. Holman Hunt. Not merely is the life of Christ a reality for him, but, to quote Mr. Ruskin again, it is 'the one Reality' before which all other aspects of truth grow pale. Filled, he has told us himself, with an earnest desire to illustrate the greatest of all histories, satisfied in these days of failing hope and faith that the Father of all had not left us, he was seized with the noble ambition 'to prove, so far as painting could, that Christianity was a living faith, that the fullest realization of its wondrous story cannot unspiritualize it; that followed up, new lessons and fresh interests may present themselves by the teaching of art; it was used to teach, not only to divert, in the days when it was at its highest.'

With this end in view he left home and spent years in Palestine, painting at Jerusalem and Nazareth, and on the desolate shores of the Dead Sea, where close by all was salt and burnt limestone, decaying trees and skeletons of dead animals, and afar the mountains glowed with the brilliancy and preciousness of jewels. This was the scene he chose for his great picture 'The Scapegoat,' that most moving of all his works, in which he realizes in a wonderful manner the pathos of the words, 'All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.' The small replica of this painting, formerly in the Graham collection, was exhibited at Manchester, as well as that most serenely beautiful of summer landscapes 'Strayed Sheep' and the large 'Shadow of Death,' which excited the interest of the working men in the North of England in so remarkable a manner, and is now, we rejoice to see, the property of the city of Manchester. Mr. Hunt still holds his place apart, and he remains true to his first principles. His 'Triumph of the Innocents' has shown us in recent years that his convictions are as firm, his imagination as powerful, his perseverance as indomitable as ever. But he can no longer sign himself P. R. B., he tells us, for he has no brother left. Upon one 'the slumber has fallen in untimely season,' and the other has long ago given up the principles and changed the practice of his youth.

The large and well-selected group of Sir John Millais's works did not include any of his earliest and strictly pre-

Raphaelite paintings, and it is to be regretted that the loan of his 'Lorenzo and Isabella,' which Mr. Hunt justly calls 'the most wonderful work that any youth still under twenty years of age ever did in the world,' could not be procured. On the other hand, his middle period was represented by one of his most powerful pictures, 'The Vale of Rest.' The subject represented is said to have been seen by the painter when traveling in France. A nun meditates by an open grave which a lay sister is digging within the bounds of a convent garden, while the last rays of the sun fade away behind the dark cypresses and the dying day seems to tell of the night coming, when no man shall work. Here the influence of old ideas is still present, the fire of the old enthusiasm is not yet spent. A few more years and the ardent companion of Rossetti and Hunt will be content to paint such commonplace subjects as 'Sleeping and Waking,' 'Yes or No,' 'Hearts are Trumps.'

Several of the fine portraits for which his latest period will be chiefly memorable are also to be seen here, among them one of the very finest which he has ever executed, the Mr. Gladstone of 1879.

One striking feature of the Manchester Exhibition was the opportunity which it afforded of studying the works of Mr. Ford Madox Brown, whose 'considerable reputation,' Mr. Armstrong observes, 'has grown up almost entirely without the aid of societies or exhibitions' (p. 170).

Although not actually a pre-Raphaelite, Madox Brown was closely associated with the members of the brotherhood, and helped Rossetti with his teaching, and Hunt with his sympathy and advice, from the first. His own pictures are decidedly pre-Raphaelite in their general tendency and character, but show a dramatic vigour peculiar to himself. The decoration of the Exhibition dome bore witness to those imaginative powers which we see revealed in all their fullness in the splendid series of frescoes on the walls of the Manchester Town Hall, while his best easel pictures were on view in the galleries. Of these the most famous—'Work,' on which he was engaged for twelve years—is too crowded with figures and too complex in aim to be entirely satisfactory, although it is full of interest as reflecting the moral and social aspirations of the age and introducing portraits of Carlyle and Maurice, the mental workers, by the side of the British navy, in marked contrast with the idlers and pleasure-seekers who have never learnt to work. His drawings of 'Elijah and the Widow's Son' and of 'The Entombment' are remarkable for their rich colour and tragic

gran
but
of
ever
blos
bric
the
the
leap
All
of t
mon
know
and

M
origi
Mr.
man
close
that
natio
mast
origi
and
scien
been
forme
that
enter
conte
of gi
ment
which
splen
for m
lery,
variet
bear
artisti
legene
Less
our in
or Ma
us ab
Days

grandeur, and deserve to be worked out on a larger scale; but the finest of all his pictures is the 'Romeo and Juliet,' of which Mr. Armstrong gives an engraving. Here, while every carefully painted accessory—the fruit trees laden with blossom, the yellow light in the sky behind the tall red brick towers of Verona—helps to enhance the central idea of the picture, nothing is allowed to interfere with the unity of the pictorial motive, with the force of Romeo's passion as, leaping over the balcony, he rushes into the arms of Juliet. All the short sad story of those lovers, all the tragic beauty of that immortal tale, is gathered up in this one supreme moment. By the side of this picture Frank Dicksee's well-known rendering of the same passage, graceful and refined and poetic as it is, seemed poor and stogy.

Mr. Armstrong considers Mr. Madox Brown to be the real originator of the new development of pre-Raphaelism, of which Mr. Burne Jones is the head; and M. Chesneau, in the same manner, classes the two together. Most persons will see a closer affinity between the work of the last-named artist and that of Rossetti. In splendour of colouring and mystic imagination the two are very closely allied, and if the younger master's genius hardly attains that of the elder in power and originality, he surpasses him in intellectual vigour, in grace and beauty of design. It has been remarked that the men of science and letters of the latter half of the Victorian age have been chiefly engaged in working out the great ideas of the former half. In this manner it may be said of Mr. Burne Jones that he has reaped the fruit of his predecessors' labours and entered upon the inheritance of their struggles. Chief among contemporary artists in poetic conception and in the power of giving reality to his dreams, his art is the higher development of the old pre-Raphaelite school, the perfect flower which has blossomed on the parent stem. The series of splendid masterpieces exhibited at Manchester have formed for many summers the chief attraction of the Grosvenor Gallery, and are too well known to need description. In their variety of subject and carefully thought out composition they bear witness as much to the painter's scholarship as to his artistic gifts, and show the same sympathy with Christian legend as with the fables of Greek or Teutonic mythology. Less emotional than Rossetti, Burne Jones appeals rather to our intellect than to our passions, and where Holman Hunt or Madox Brown would have represented persons he gives us abstract ideas under the form of symbolic figures—'The Days of Creation' rather than 'Adam and Eve,' 'The Wheel

of Fortune' rather than the tragedy of King Lear. But his religious paintings lack the intense reality of Holman Hunt's work, and for all their loveliness leave us cold. His beautiful faces are all touched with the same nineteenth-century spirit of unrest, the same sense of loss or regret. For them life is a sad and weary thing, and the best the painter can do for us is to lead us into some quiet vale, far removed from the strife and turmoil of men, where Pan sits piping by the waterside, and bid us dream away the years in this delightful garden and forget, if we can, how soon we have to die.

In his own sphere Mr. Burne Jones stands alone, but of those who follow in his steps and drink inspiration at the same fountain the two best, Mr. Walter Crane and Mr. Spencer Stanhope, are well represented at Manchester. More akin to Rossetti and Madox Brown in the freshness and vigour of invention is Mr. Frederick Shields, whose fine single figure of Lazarus coming forth in his grave clothes at the voice of Christ hangs on the same wall, and whose cartoons for the decoration of the Duke of Westminster's chapel at Eaton show that at least one of our younger artists is not lacking in lofty spiritual imagination.

In the same gallery as these modern pre-Raphaelites, exactly facing Mr. Burne Jones's picture, hung upwards of twenty paintings by Mr. Watts, the other representative of mythical painting in England, whose work it has been 'to place at the service of former imagination the art which it had not, and to realize for us, with a truth then impossible, the visions described by the wisest of men as embodying their most pious thoughts and their most exalted doctrines.' No finer sight was to be found in the whole Exhibition than the wall devoted to the works of this veteran painter. Above were his great symbolical pictures, Hope in her blue robes, striking the one remaining string of her lyre, between Love the poor child who struggles vainly to resist the march of Death, and Love the angel form who leads Life gently over the rocks and up the heavenward path. Below in a long row hung the magnificent portraits of poets, and statesmen, and painters, and thinkers whose names have shed lustre on the Victorian age, a splendid achievement for any one lifetime.

The technical defects of Mr. Watts's art have often been pointed out, but we lose sight of these in the grandeur of his conceptions and the steadfastness with which he has maintained throughout the whole of a long career his high belief in the great mission of Art. Nowadays, when we remember

ho
ou
his

to-
dev
wa
Ge
wit
ticu
ver
gal

Bot
that
clos
way
emo
unfe
tatic
class
posit
deals

V
in 18
say t
death
work
this l
Whet
of lif
ploug
age, c
Gate,
canno
No p
or he
Bathe
of an
And y
sense
there

how long he has been painting for us, we look about us among our younger artists, and ask ourselves in vain who will fill his place when he is gone.

From the gallery which held the works of the giants of to-day we must now turn to another room almost entirely devoted to the paintings of two masters whose short career was too soon closed by an early death, Frederick Walker and George Mason. Mr. Hodgson, who was intimately acquainted with both these men and supplies some interesting particulars about them, remarks on the sad significance of the verse of Chaucer which was written up over the door of this gallery :

'The life so short,
The craft so long to learne ;
The essay so hard,
So sharpe the conquering.'

Both painters started from the pre-Raphaelite point of view—that is to say, they took Truth as their motto—and seeing the close connexion between art and life, strove each in his own way to express the common joys and sorrows, the varying emotions of everyday life, in the most real and vivid way, unfettered either by choice of subject or manner of representation by conventional rules. Both have the same touch of classic grace, the same feeling for beauty of form and composition. Finally, the art of both men is genuinely English, and deals almost exclusively with scenes of modern English life.

Walker's genius was the most powerful, and when he died in 1875, at the early age of thirty-five, great possibilities, to say the least, perished with him. The shadow of that early death darkened his life, and makes itself felt in all his finest work. His imagination beats restlessly against the walls of this life, asking what lies beyond and whither we are tending. Whether he paints strong-limbed peasants in the prime of life and strength, 'in glory and in pride following the plough along the mountain-side,' or the contrast of youth and age, of care and sorrow, in the figures meeting at the Old Gate, we are conscious of the coming end. It is not that he cannot be joyous, or that his themes were invariably sad ones. No picture was ever painted which breathed with a fresher or healthier life, a keener joy in action, than that of 'The Bathers.' None reflects the still glory and midsummer beauty of an English riverside better than his 'Sunny Thames.' And yet through all the light and colour, through all the sense of pleasure in work, of delight in human loveliness, there runs an undertone of sadness. The fiery splendour of

the sunset, the russet tints of the trees under the grey autumn skies, the murmur of hurrying waters, all seem to tell the same tale—'Man goeth forth to his labour *until the evening.*'

Mason's art is of a gentler and a happier kind. To him this world is all fair and good; he leads us to the vales and meadows of Arcady, and shows us the reapers going homewards in the soft twilight of the harvest moon, the village children dancing on the green slopes by the summer sea, the tired horses bearing the last load home at the end of the day. His short life had its full share of struggles and hardships, and, as was the case with Walker, suffering and weakness darkened his latter days; but there was room in his heart for all the sweet sights and pleasant sounds around him, and to the last his sympathy with Nature and with struggling humanity never failed him. The works of both these painters have become widely known by the fine etchings of Mr. Macbeth, and both, but more especially Walker, have had a marked influence on our present school of landscape painting.

It is impossible here to do justice to those isolated artists who, without belonging to any particular school or line of thought, have helped to adorn the Victorian age, and whose art was worthily represented at Manchester. Foremost among them comes Sir Frederick Leighton, the President of the Royal Academy. No man is better fitted for the post, whether by virtue of his accomplishments as painter, sculptor, orator, and scholar, or by his ready and generous recognition of merit in others. His youth was spent almost entirely abroad, and it is to foreign training that Sir Frederick owes his masterly draughtsmanship and thorough knowledge of the human frame. Everything he paints is marked by the same accurate rendering of form, the same truly artistic spirit. His lovely forms and softly blended colours have a witchery which has been compared to that of Correggio's art. They are always delightful to look upon, but altogether too delicate and transparent to be natural. While his pictures are remarkable for variety of subject and diversity of treatment, he has of late years shown an increasing delight in Hellenic themes, in all that belongs to classical fable and Greek literature. His 'Daphnephoria,' a Greek procession containing some thirty figures and painted with the utmost skill and unwearying patience, is a grand specimen of decorative art, and his frescoes of the Arts of Peace and War at the South Kensington Museum, and of the Ten Virgins at Lyndhurst Church, deserve mention as the finest mural paintings of the day; but his dead Alcestis,

lyin
pur
with

N
reason
textu
duced
Now
this is
work
the R
lovely
but M
us, an
workm
very r
power
Mr. O
a parti
repres
popula
chester
Leslie,
birds fr
Mr.
art has
dates fr
to be a
during
the rap
their w
cannot
the influ

VOL.

lying white-robed, with the weeping maidens about her and her pure profile against the dark blue waves, while Hercules wrestles with the mighty giant Death, is to our mind his greatest work.

'I knew, too, a great Kaunian painter, strong
As Herakles, though rosy with a robe
Of grace, that softens down the sinewy strength :
And he has made a picture of it all.
There lies Alkestis dead, beneath the sun
She longed to look her last upon, beside
The sea, which somehow tempts the life in us
To come trip over its white waste of waves,
And try escape from earth, and fleet as free.
. . . I pronounce that piece
Worthy to set up in our Poikilè !'¹

Next to the President, M. Alma Tadéma is conspicuous by reason of his great technical skill, his unrivalled painting of texture, and the extraordinary manner in which he has reproduced the life of the Roman Empire in all its minutest details. Now and then he has shown signs of dramatic power, but this is seldom, and perhaps the most perfect instance of his work at Manchester is a tiny picture called 'The Rose of all the Roses.' In this little canvas, blue seas, white roses, a lovely maiden form, and a marble floor, painted as no one but M. Tadéma knows how to paint it, are all brought before us, and the result is a gem of the rarest and most exquisite workmanship. Mr. Poynter and Mr. W. B. Richmond come very near to the two last-named painters in their technical powers and treatment of classical subjects, and of late years Mr. Orchardson has rivalled M. Tadéma's skill in reproducing a particular period, and attained great popularity by his skilful representation of eighteenth-century *salons*. Among other popular painters whose best works are to be seen at Manchester we cannot do more than name Edwin Long, G. D. Leslie, and H. S. Marks, whose genuine love of beasts and birds finds expression in so many humorous forms.

Mr. Armstrong observes that one striking feature of recent art has been the movement towards French ideals, which he dates from the time of the Paris Exhibition of 1867. This is to be ascribed, he thinks, partly to the influx of French artists during the Franco-German war, partly to the fact that among the rapidly increasing number of English students many find their way to Parisian *ateliers* in search of the training they cannot obtain at home. Another cause which he names is the influence of Mr. Whistler, whose art is certainly unique in

¹ *Balaustion's Adventure*, by Robert Browning, p. 168.

its way, but none of whose works, whether pastels or etchings, were exhibited at Manchester. This tendency to imitate modern French art, and allow ourselves to be influenced by foreign standards of taste, is steadily increasing at the present time, and is by no means one of the happiest features of contemporary painting.

If we turn to landscape art many well-known names occur to us at once, even if there are none to rival the illustrious water-colour masters of the early Victorian age. Cecil Lawson, whose artistic impulse was so genuine and whose short career was so full of bright promise, has too soon passed away, but Alfred Hunt charms us yearly by his delicate and poetic rendering of effects of light, of gabled roofs touched with rose-red sunset glow, or fishing boats on a twilight sea; Alfred Parsons paints Avon meadows and West Country apple orchards, river banks, and wayside flowers with rare delicacy and freedom of hand; J. W. North and Mrs. Allingham follow in the steps of Walker; and Thorne Waite, Hine, and Thomas Collier keep alive the best traditions of the old water-colour school; while other masters, such as B. W. Leader, Vicat Cole, and the Scottish school of landscape painters, with Peter Graham and MacWhirter at their head, set themselves to repeat certain phases of nature year by year with varying degrees of skill and different measures of success. Two separate developments of contemporary art in recent years are the school of battle painters, which owes its origin to the success of Miss Thompson's 'Roll Call' in 1876, and that of sea painters, which dates further back, but has lately achieved some remarkable triumphs. Mr. Hook stands at the head of the last-named school, both in virtue of his age and his long roll of well-conceived and finely executed works, fresh with the smell of salt water and the cheery ring of the fisherman's voice; while Brett goes on painting the smooth expanse of rippling waters, and Henry Moore, with bolder hand and more spontaneous genius, rejoices in flashing sunlight and rolling seas—'deeply, darkly, beautifully blue.'

Yet more important is the development of portrait painting which the last twenty years have witnessed, a change the more remarkable if we look back, as we did at Manchester, to the beginning of the Queen's reign. Then, portrait painting was a merely decorative thing, and people were satisfied with a tolerably fair likeness in the face of the sitter, and asked for nothing more. Now our best portrait painters aim at nothing short of a complete representation of the sitter's personality, his inner as well as his outer characteristics. Here

Mill
at th
palm
pass
last
tion,
bega
prod
and
art;
spirit
each
We h
in th
and a
in tec
on th
ment
equal
ledge
N
taken
artists
can p
ments
And
genius
Manch
these s
'waste
has pr
hope a
We let
almost
genero
paint t
his pro
of the
how th
incapac
such as
him, or
work.
struggle

Millais, Richmond, Herkomer, Frank Holl, and Oules stand at the head of their profession ; but all in turn must yield the palm to Watts, whose finest portraits have never been surpassed in completeness and beauty.

And now that we have taken this rapid glance over the last fifty years of British Art, as seen at the Manchester Exhibition, what answer can we give to the question with which we began ? We have seen much splendid and interesting work produced within this period ; we have seen the loftiest social and religious aspirations of the day reflected in contemporary art ; we have seen again the scientific spirit of the age, the spirit of research, of curiosity, of freedom of thought, applied each in their measure to the different branches of painting. We have seen—there can be no doubt of that—a vast change in the popular estimation of Art, a wide revival of interest and zeal in its pursuit, and we have also seen a great advance in technical excellence on the part of our painters. And yet, on the whole, it would be impossible to say that the development of the art of the Victorian age has in any degree been equal to the immense progress made in other fields of knowledge during this memorable period.

No brilliant and sustained Renaissance of painting has taken place in England ; no long succession of world-renowned artists will make the Victorian age famous in art history ; we can point to no striking series of frescoes in our public monuments or great churches such as adorn the cities of Italy. And yet this period has not been wanting in painters of genius. No one who looked about him in the galleries at Manchester could doubt this. But we as a nation have wasted these splendid capabilities—in the words of a great living artist, ‘wasted genius such as no other country in the modern world has produced.’ We have allowed our best painters to lose hope and faith for want of sympathy and encouragement. We let Holman Hunt well-nigh starve for want of funds, and almost drove him to emigrate to Canada ; and when Watts, in generous zeal for the education of his countrymen, offered to paint the hall of Euston Station with frescoes, we declined his proposal with thanks. Mr. Armstrong gives the history of the decoration of the Houses of Parliament, and shows how that great opportunity was thrown away from sheer incapacity on the part of the Committee. Think what a man such as Rossetti might have done had the task been given him, or how beneficial the effects would have been on his work. But ‘the bravest spirits get disheartened with a struggle in which opportunities are never given them.’

'It is not to reveal my own private troubles,' says Mr. Holman Hunt at the close of the papers in which he tells the story of his struggle for life, 'that I relate these things; other English painters have had worse. It is to save future artists from the narrow-minded opposition which I had to stem at every fresh effort. . . . People may consider whether it was consistent with any profession of interest in the attainment by England of a glory in art (such as she deservedly has in other great pursuits) that a man who had produced the earlier work ("The Finding of the Saviour") should have been left in the best years of his life, despite the fact of great diligence and carefulness, without means to continue his chosen task, except with vexatious interruptions, from sheer want of money. May I not ask whether our enemies are not now proved to have been wrong? Their violence proceeded either from my incompetence to deal with art, and that also of Rossetti and Millais to paint, or from the ignorance and injustice of our jury. Such unbounded condemnation on their part was either very right or very wrong. If Rossetti's "Annunciation" was contemptible then, it cannot be worthy enough for the nation to purchase now. If Millais's "Isabella" was atrocious then, it is not fitting of a high place in the Liverpool Permanent Art Gallery. The company I was condemned with is admitted now to be of the highest order. Had we found a public showing only a reasonable amount of interest and independence of taste, and of faith that our countrymen could and should win glory for the nation, I know that my two companions would have done greater things than can easily be imagined, and I can assert that what I now show of my life's work would be but a tithe of what there would be; but even yet, I thank God, the day leaves me opportunity to work with my might.'

Sad words to be written by the man who painted the 'Light of the World'—all the sadder because we are conscious of their truth.

The fact remains that Art is not an essential in the lives of most English men and women, and does not appeal to the people of England as a whole. And, since the national spirit is not in sympathy with it, the Victorian age has not produced an art that corresponds to its high degree of culture and civilization. M. Chesneau, for his part, considers that the uneducated state of public taste is at fault, and accounts for this by saying that the English soul has no ardent craving after the perfect expression of beauty.

'It seems to me as if a picture, to this nation, meant nothing more than a luxury, and as if a *chef-d'œuvre*—albeit considered a fine acquisition, as testifying to the worldly prosperity and distinction of the possessor—is powerless to produce the sensation of delight and elevation which might be looked for in the contemplation of a great work. This has been during a century the condition of art in England. And this explains the desire among purchasers to obtain

prod
Sinc
striv
ordin

The
rema
the
whic
trick
men
in th
caug
ideal
'Art
sion
the f
again
impl

'V
in 18
and i
eyes t
shoul
scienc
which

The a
we h
other
serve
Acces
right
these
amon
and
every
all lov
not o
abroad
great

'E
nobles
four-an
into th
service

productions which display singularity rather than simple beauty. Since they only wish to procure an object for amusement, they strive, with method in their madness, to light on what is extraordinary and out of the way' (p. 162).

'There is, it must be confessed, a good deal of truth in this remark of the French critic. For year by year we see how the pictures which attract the most public notice are those which are distinguished by some sensational feature, some trick in the lighting, some startling effect or novel arrangement; and so the successful artist is encouraged to indulge in the perpetual repetition of the particular device which first caught the popular fancy, instead of seeking after higher ideals and a more perfect realization of their conceptions. 'Art as a whole does not progress.' This, too, is the conclusion at which Mr. Armstrong arrives when he has reviewed the fine art of the Victorian age; and he ends by warning us against the fallacy of thinking that a finer *technique* necessarily implies a finer art.

'Wilkie said acutely of French painting, when he saw it in Paris in 1814, that it was the result, and not the cause, of encouragement; and in all our hopes for art in England, in all our straining of the eyes to descry the advent of new genius upon our home horizons, we should guard against the mistake of accepting the means for the end, science for art, and ability to realize with the fingers for the faculty which conceives' (p. 176).

The advice is well timed and salutary, and will be remembered, we hope, as much by our critics as by our painters. On the other hand, there is no doubt that, as Mr. Armstrong also observes, 'Art is more alive in England than it was at the Queen's Accession, and an enormously larger number of people have right ideas about it than they had then' (p. 176). To spread these right ideas among all classes and grades of people—among our statesmen and our thinkers, our patrons of art and buyers of pictures, our working men and women in every rank of life—must be the earnest and unceasing aim of all lovers of art. In order to attain this end it is necessary, not only that high-class art literature should be widely spread abroad, but that every opportunity should be taken of setting great works of art before the public.

'Every means of stimulating, cultivating, and popularizing the noblest expressions of art,' said Mr. Watts, when he was examined four-and-twenty years ago before the Royal Commission of Enquiry into the position of the Royal Academy, 'should be pressed into service. Until the people at large grow to care about it it can

never take root in England, and this they can never do until it shall be presented to them habitually; but a people who care more for Handel's music than that of any other composer would not long be insensible to similar impressions conveyed in a different but very analogous form. . . . For public improvement it is necessary that works of sterling but simple excellence should be scattered abroad as widely as possible. At present the public never see anything beautiful except in exhibition rooms, when the novelty of sight-seeing naturally disturbs the intellectual perceptions. As I believe the love of beauty to be inherent in the human mind, there must be some unfortunate influence at work; to counteract this should be the object of a fine-art institution, and I feel assured, if really good things were scattered among the people, it would not be long before satisfactory results exhibited themselves.'

In proportion as 'right ideas' gain ground, and the public mind is educated to a proper understanding and appreciation of art, the sympathy of the people will be enlisted, our painters will receive the encouragement they need, and thus, stimulated to higher efforts, will 'represent worthily things worthy to be represented.' So we may yet live to see that Art Renaissance which a recent American writer has assured us is about to dawn on the world, a Renaissance worthy of the advanced state of civilization we have reached, higher and nobler than any that has gone before. Of that Renaissance which is yet to come we shall then recognize the germ and beginning in the Fine Art of the Victorian age.

ART. X.—FIFTY YEARS OF DOCUMENTARY DISCOVERIES ON CHURCH HISTORY.

Urkundenfunde zur Geschichte des christlichen Alterthums.
Von Dr. GOTTHARD VICTOR LECHLER, ord. Professor der
Theologie, Geh. Kirchenrath in Leipzig. (Leipzig, 1886.)

THE celebration of the Queen's Jubilee has given occasion for the publication of many reviews of the progress the nation has made during the last fifty years. It seems, then, not an unsuitable time to take a review of what the last fifty years have gained for us of materials for the knowledge of Church history; for in respect of the coming to light of new documents, the years of our Queen's reign will well bear com-

parison with any previous period of equal length. So many important 'finds' have been made, that we cannot help asking ourselves whether we have come to the end of them. Is there any chance that any of the works now set down as lost may yet be recovered? What a light it would throw on the history of our Gospels if there should be disinterred from the library of some Eastern monastery that *Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord* by Papias, about which so much ingenuity of conjecture has been expended! What if a copy should have escaped destruction of Porphyry's learned assault on the Christian faith, a work so hateful to believers that they seem not to have had even patience to read the answers to it—at least these answers, though some of them were written by distinguished men, have failed to reach us—and yet a work which, if we now had it, would probably give us a fuller picture of the Christianity of the third century than is presented in the writings of many an orthodox divine? What if some New Testament MS. should come to light earlier than any we have got, the earliest of which only dates from the fourth century?

It seems unreasonable to hope for much of new discovery, now that the treasures of the civilized parts of the world have been so well explored. The records of the earliest Christian centuries, to which we should now attach the most value, did not excite the same interest in the minds of the scribes of the Middle Ages, who preferred to transcribe many documents which we could bear to lose with little grief. Our hopes of finding really old books or papers still surviving become faint when we read many a true story of the destruction of ancient libraries through the waste of ignorant possessors, who either allowed valuable papers to rot uncared for, or even applied them to base uses. According to Tischendorf's story, he was barely in time to save the Sinaitic MS. of the New Testament from being used in lighting fires. The regions whose literary treasures have been least explored are also those where waste and destruction are likely to have had greatest range of exercise. Every year the chance of finding old documents undestroyed must be becoming less; and if we should find a heap of such, the chances are that the greater part would be things for which we should not much care. Lord Bacon complained that time was like a river, which bore on its surface things light and worthless, while the weighty matter sank to the bottom. Yet if we must not be too sanguine in our hopes, the knowledge of what the last fifty years have gained for us may teach us not to despair. For at the time when Queen Victoria ascended the throne it might have

been argued, as we have argued now, that there was little reason to anticipate much addition to the then existing sources of knowledge.

There will no doubt be many readers of this Review for whom nothing that we have to tell will have any novelty; but there is a pleasure in being reminded of what we know, as well as in being told what we do not know. We called to mind at the beginning of this article how many narratives of the secular events of the reign have been lately published, and have been read with interest by persons themselves well able to remember most of the things related. The tract by Dr. Lechler, which is the subject of this article, is intended to give an account of the documents throwing light on early Church history which have been recovered within the last fifty years; and though naturally he wrote last year without thought of our Jubilee, it so happens that he begins with the first year of our Sovereign's reign. Although we can ourselves well remember the surprise and pleasure with which we heard of most of the discoveries of which he tells, we read his tract with so much interest that we think our readers will be glad to receive an account of this very opportune publication. A review article in modern times is commonly an independent dissertation, for which the title of the book reviewed only furnishes a motto. Ours must be one of the modest reviews of the old school, which aimed at no more than giving a faithful account of the contents of the work reported on; for we write in an Alpine village, at a distance from books, and have learned by sad experience the danger of putting too much confidence in our memory.

Dr. Lechler begins by stating the limitations necessary in order to bring what he has to tell within reasonable compass. Thus he restricts himself to discoveries throwing light on the history of the first six centuries, although he gives specimens of interesting things which might be related if he were to carry the history lower down. He confines himself also to speaking of documents. Thus he refrains, for example, from saying anything about the explorations made in the Roman catacombs, about the discovery of ancient buildings, and about inscriptions. This last subject is in itself extensive enough to furnish materials for an article. Those who have read Bishop Lightfoot's recent volumes will know how important a part inscriptions play both in determining the date of Polycarp's martyrdom and in enabling us to identify the Asiarch who presided over the games at which he suffered. Many still disputed questions in chronology might be settled

by the very possible recovery of an inscription enabling us to determine the date when office was held by a proconsul whom we know of in connexion with the events in question. We need not speak of other services rendered by inscriptions, the importance of paying attention to them being fully felt by all modern writers on Church history. We have now only to speak of documents, of which Lechler treats in chronological order, arranging them, however, according to the order when the discoveries were made, not according to the dates when the discoveries were published. Accordingly he gives the first place to Dressel's discovery of the conclusion of the Clementine Homilies, which appears to have taken place in 1837, the first year of Queen Victoria's reign, though not actually published till 1852.

I. In the speculations of the Tübingen School concerning the early history of the Christian Church a prominent place is occupied by a work which was given circulation in Rome at the end of the second century, or not long after. In the form in which it then appeared it was written in the name of the Roman Clement, and professed to give an account of St. Peter's preaching to the Gentiles and of his controversies with Simon Magus. That form of the work which is known as the Clementine Homilies was published by Cotelier in his *Apostolic Fathers* in 1672; but the MS. on which Cotelier's edition was based was defective, for although it stated that the complete work contained twenty homilies, it broke off in the middle of the nineteenth, and it was more than a century and a half before the gap could be filled up. In 1837, as we have said, Dressel, a Saxon scholar who was engaged in literary research at Rome, found in the Vatican Library an unmutilated MS. containing also a better text of the Homilies, a MS. to which no attention had previously been paid, probably because the heretical work which it contained had excited little interest.

But, however unorthodox may have been the doctrine of this work, its undoubted antiquity gives it importance in the eyes of historical students. One question which it raised was whether the writer manifests acquaintance with our Gospels. In the discourses ascribed to St. Peter sayings of our Lord are quoted, in substance agreeing with the report of our Gospels, but ordinarily differing somewhat in form. Are we to suppose that the writer drew his information from Gospels other than those we know, and which have now perished, or is it enough to say that some distortion of quotation was a literary necessity?—for too close a copying of our Gospels would

betray at once that we had to deal with one completely dependent on the written record, and not, as was pretended, an apostle speaking from independent knowledge and at a time before any Gospels were written. With the controversy as regards the Synoptic Gospels we have here no concern, nor indeed is there much need to speak of it; for, as St. John's Gospel is allowed by all to be the latest of the four, it will hardly be disputed that, if the Clementine writer was acquainted with that, it is likely that he knew also the other three. Now there are in the first eighteen of the Clementine Homilies several coincidences with St. John's Gospel, the most obvious explanation of which was that the homilist had borrowed from St. John. But this the critics of the Tübingen School obstinately refused to admit. Hilgenfeld, in 1850, urged the extreme improbability that the Clementine writer would make use of a book with which he was doctrinally at utter variance, his work being so deeply marked by Jewish Ebionitism as to be outside the limits of orthodoxy, whereas no New Testament book more completely throws down the barrier between Jew and Gentile than does the fourth Gospel. Hilgenfeld's positive conclusion was that there is no instance of the use of St. John's Gospel in the Homilies. The same conclusion was maintained by Zeller, in the *Theologische Jahrbücher* for 1853, who declared that the attempts were vain which had been made to establish an acquaintance with St. John on the part of the Clementine writer. It was exactly then that Dressel's complete edition of the Clementine Homilies appeared, and in the newly recovered 20th Homily there was found a distinct reference to the healing of the man born blind (John ix.) and to the disciples' question, 'Whether did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?'

The result has been that the Clementine use of St. John may be said now to be completely acknowledged. Volkmar owned the decisiveness of the new proof in 1854. So did Strauss in his *New Life of Jesus* in 1864. Hilgenfeld showed some reluctance at first, but in his Introduction to the New Testament in 1875 makes full acknowledgment. In fact, those critics who regard as pure invention the things related by St. John and not mentioned by the other Evangelists, feel it to be a less evil to acknowledge the Clementine use of St. John than to assert that a story peculiar to the fourth Evangelist had been confirmed by an independent tradition. Lagarde counts fifteen passages of St. John made use of in the Clementines, none of which it is worth any one's while to dispute, now that the Clementine writer's acquaintance with the Gospel has been

established in one clear case. But the value of the victory on this point has been greatly enhanced by the efforts that were made to avoid yielding it. For Hilgenfeld's proof that the author of the Homilies was in point of doctrine at the opposite pole from St. John entitles us to say that the fourth Gospel must have been a long time in established credit and authority when the Clementine forger wrote, else he would not have made such frequent use of a book with which he could have had no sympathy.

Another interesting result obtained from Dressel's discovery is that we are now assured how the story ended. It appears that the original story of the preaching of Peter and of his conflict with Simon Magus described all as taking place in Eastern cities. The story of a conflict at Rome between Peter and Simon Magus is seen to be a later addition, probably first imagined when the *Preaching of Peter* was adapted to Roman use, and afterwards amplified by legend.

II. The next 'find' which we have to relate takes us to a different period of Church history, viz. the end of the fourth century. A parchment MS. in the Paris Library, written in uncial characters, contains, among other matter, the Acts of the Council of Aquileia in 381. A German scholar, Krust, took notice that on the broad margin of some of the leaves there was writing in a cursive hand. And being himself obliged to leave Paris, he directed to the MS. the attention of another German scholar, Professor Waitz, who edited this marginal matter in 1840. It was found to contain controversial notes by an Arian bishop, Maximin, criticizing the statements in the Acts of the Aquileian Council. We are on firmer ground in writing the history of any heresy, the more we are able to balance the accounts of it given by orthodox writers by documents written from the heretical point of view. But what has especial interest for us in the fragment of which we are treating is that it gives us new materials for the life of Ulfilas, the Apostle of the Goths, who exercised immense influence over that nation, who translated the Scriptures for their use, and who for that purpose had to create the Gothic written character. It was known that he was an Arian, and that under his teaching Arianism became the creed of the Goths; but our previous authorities for his life, being separated from him by some interval of time, and emanating from persons apparently with no sufficient means of knowledge, left us uncertain on several points. The new information, though not as full as might be desired, may be regarded as peculiarly trustworthy,

for it rests on a relation made by Auxentius, Bishop of Durostorum, who tells us that he had been from early childhood the ward and pupil of Ulfilas. Having so many things to speak of, we cannot enter into details as to the facts now put in a clearer light, but refer our readers to the little volume about Ulfilas published not long since by Mr. C. A. A. Scott.

III. In the two instances just considered we had not to tell of any importation of new MSS., but only of gains made by a closer examination of the contents of old libraries. Great libraries have not always had learned and intelligent librarians; and even a learned and intelligent librarian cannot be expected to have leisure and inclination to examine carefully all the books under his charge. Thus it has been quite possible for libraries to contain treasures unknown to their possessors. A curious instance how even a book which is known to be in a library can remain concealed from its custodians is presented by the late Mr. Bradshaw's discovery of a volume in the Cambridge University Library, which had for a long time been supposed to have been lost, but which was actually standing all the time in its proper place on the shelf, only disguised by having been bound with a wrong title. The scholars of a century or two ago had to make laborious travels in order to explore the contents of isolated libraries. The scholars of the present day have their labours immensely lightened not only by greater facilities of travel, but by the work which is actively going on of publishing catalogues of the MS. possessions of different libraries. Thus they know beforehand where what they are in search of is likely to be found; and as each MS. is brought under the scrutiny of scholars with special knowledge and interest in the subject, peculiarities are discovered which would easily escape the notice of an ordinary cataloguer. We may cite for example Mr. Bensly's discovery that the copy of the Fourth Book of Esdras in the Communal Library at Amiens contained a considerable passage absent from all previously known Latin MSS.

The discovery which we have next to mention was indeed of a volume brought from the East in recent times, but which had yet run a risk of passing into the class of 'unsuspected treasures' of an old library. In the year 1842 a collection of Greek MSS. was brought from the monasteries of Mount Athos to Paris, gathered by a Greek scholar, Mynoides Mynas, who had been commissioned for the purpose by Villemain, then Minister of Public Instruction. Among these MSS. was one which at first attracted no attention. It was not older than the fourteenth century, it bore no author's

name, and it had the uninviting title, 'A Refutation of all Heresies.' But after a few years an official of the Paris Library, Emmanuel Miller, had his attention drawn to the book, in which he imagined that he had discovered a work of Origen. The Clarendon Press at Oxford undertook the publication of the work, which appeared in 1851 under the title *Origenis Philosophumena sive Omnium Hæresium Refutatio*. That the work was as old as the time of Origen all scholars were soon agreed, but equally so that Origen was not the author; for he appears to claim to be a bishop, and certainly to have taken an active part in controversies at Rome. Who the author was became for some time a subject of hot dispute; but a general agreement has now been arrived at that he was Hippolytus, who has commonly been described as Bishop of Portus, and who was at any rate one of the chief representatives of the learning of the Roman Church at the beginning of the third century. Besides the controversy concerning its authorship to which the discovery of this treatise gave rise, there were two other points on which active literary discussion arose.

Two Roman pontiffs, contemporary with the author, Zephyrinus and Callistus, had till then enjoyed an unblemished reputation, and had been honoured with the title of Saint. The memory of the latter has been specially preserved in connexion with his work on the Roman Catacombs. If we were to believe this writer, we must regard these two Popes as men not only of indifferent moral character, but as heretical in doctrine. Zephyrinus is treated with comparative leniency, his errors being attributed to his rustic ignorance, and no worse moral fault being laid to his charge than excessive love of money. But with Callistus the writer had come into personal controversy. The subject in dispute was the union of the two Natures in the Person of our Lord. Hippolytus charged Callistus with countenancing the error of those who removed all distinction between the Father and the Son. Callistus retorted by accusing Hippolytus of having two Gods. There were disputes also as to Church discipline, which seem to indicate that Hippolytus and Callistus were at the heads of rival congregations—the latter, who adopted a laxer discipline, receiving into his communion persons excommunicated by the former. In the treatise of which we speak a scandalous account is given of the life of Callistus, who is described as originally a slave, as a fraudulent bankrupt, as having attempted suicide, as having gained the honour of confessorship on false pretences—the offence for which he was really

punished being not the profession of Christianity but brawling in a Jewish synagogue—and as having imposed on the simplicity of Zephyrinus so as to obtain promotion from him, though he had been treated with marked distrust by the previous bishop, Victor. It is evident what use could be made in the Roman controversy of this third-century evidence that popes were then regarded as neither impeccable nor infallible. The late Bishop Wordsworth published a work in which all the statements of the newly discovered volume were accepted as true, and the obvious inferences were drawn from them. Cardinal Newman was so scandalized that he positively refused to believe that so libellous a story could have been penned by Hippolytus, whom the Church has always honoured as a saint and a martyr. The proof, however, that the *Refutation of all Heresies* is really the work of Hippolytus is too strong to be resisted; and Von Döllinger, then the most learned divine in the Roman Church, made the ingenious defence, which he supported by strong arguments, that whatever sins or errors Hippolytus charged on Callistus he charged none on the Bishop of Rome, for that he did not acknowledge Callistus as such, but claimed to be Bishop of Rome himself. But as Church history does not show the slightest trace of a schism in the popedom at this period, if we accept Von Döllinger's theory we are led to the conclusion that the whole Christian world must at the beginning of the third century have been singularly indifferent who was Bishop of Rome, and that the see could be claimed by rival candidates, one of them the member of the Roman Church whose writings were best known outside of Italy, and yet that no one should appear to be aware of the dispute.

Enough has been said to illustrate the importance and interest of one class of the controversies to which the discovery of this treatise gave rise. To speak now of another, a marked feature of the treatise was that it poured a flood of new light on the Gnostic speculations of the second century. Several Gnostic heresies were among those which the author undertook to refute, and in doing so he gave large quotations from several Gnostic works previously unknown. What value was to be attached to these extracts became the subject of a new class of controversies. For example, the picture of the heresy of Basilides presented in this work of Hippolytus is quite different from that presented in the account of Irenæus; which of them are we to esteem more worthy of credit? But deeper interest attached to another question: almost all these extracts, including those ascribed to the oldest heretics, such as Basilides

and
Gos
tha
thes
con
thro
foun
low
to c
an i
and

MS
of S
Mus
Egy
char
to a
into
of
to t
a ge
nar
inhe
who
foun
scor
whic
abou
more
who
the
a jo
pura
to th
side
lang
few
the
lang
year
roni
MS
Nitr
his c

and Valentinus, agree in making large use of the fourth Gospel. If we accept the extracts as genuine, the date of that Gospel is established as antecedent to the rise of any of these heresies. In order to escape this conclusion, it was contended that Hippolytus must, either through mistake or through carelessness in writing, have ascribed to the early founders of heretical sects works really written by their followers not long before his time. This would not be the place to discuss that question. We merely wish to give our readers an idea of the importance of the discovery of this little treatise and of the controversies which arose out of it.

IV. The discoveries hitherto described were of isolated MSS. We come now to a larger subject, viz. the collection of Syrian MSS. brought from the Nitrian Desert to the British Museum. As the Nile, coming down from Upper to Middle Egypt, approaches the point of the Delta, the mountain chains which hitherto had closely bounded its course retire to a greater distance, and that on the west side breaks off into isolated heights separated by flat barren tracts, a land of salt and sulphur. The name 'Nitrian Desert'—known to the early Christians as the desert of Scete—is given in a general way to the whole district, though strictly it has a narrower signification. As early as the second century this inhospitable region became the abode of Christian anchorites who sought to withdraw from the society of men. In the fourth century, when the monastic life became fashionable, scores of monasteries were established in this district, of which only four now remain. In one of these, somewhere about the eighth century, a company of Syrian Jacobite monks settled, with the consent of the Coptic Patriarch, with whose doctrine, as Monophysites, they were in unison. In the year A.D. 932 the then Abbot Moses brought back from a journey to Mesopotamia 250 valuable Syriac MSS., partly purchased, partly presented to him. From the second century to the seventh, Syriac-speaking Christians had exhibited considerable literary activity, and had translated into their own language many valuable Greek theological works, including a few now preserved in no other form. But in the course of time the successors of these monks lost the knowledge of the Syriac language, and these treasures became useless to them. In the year 1707 Pope Clement XI., who had been urged by the Maronites settled at Rome to attempt to gain some of the Syriac MSS., which they were able to tell him could be found in Nitrian monasteries, sent Elias Assemani, and eight years later his cousin Joseph Simon Assemani, to the East with this object

in view. The result was the gain of over 150 Syriac MSS. for the Vatican Library, the most important of the contents of which were made known to the world through various publications of the Assemani family, in particular their *Bibliotheca Orientalis*. Not more, however, than about forty of the MSS. brought back by the Assemani came from the Nitrian monasteries of which we have made mention; and the lion's share of that collection finally fell to the lot of the English nation. A small portion was obtained by Archdeacon Tattam, who travelled in Egypt in search of Coptic MSS. in 1839. This led to negotiations for the purchase of the entire library, which was gained in successive instalments, the last in 1851. The late Canon Cureton speedily devoted himself to the study and publication of these Syriac MSS., and his work has been ably carried on by his successor in this department of the British Museum, Professor Wright.¹ Lechler considers Cureton's publications in the chronological order of the authors edited.

(1) First is to be mentioned a discovery of by no means the same importance now as when it was first announced, at which time it excited great interest and raised no little controversy. The genuineness of the letters ascribed to Ignatius had for a couple of centuries been fiercely contested; though the sagacity of Ussher had put out of court the larger collection long current in Latin, and had reduced the question to that of the genuineness of the seven letters recognized by Eusebius. Cureton now found in Syriac three of these seven letters, and these in a shorter form than the corresponding Greek epistles, and he regarded these Syriac letters as representing the original Ignatius out of which the Greek form had been developed. This middle view was neither acceptable to those who had defended, nor to the majority of those who had impugned, the genuineness of the Greek epistles; but it found favour with some very eminent scholars. The fact that the Ignatian letters had been tampered with by a forger in the fourth century is certainly not logically a reason for thinking it likely that a previous forger had been at work on them in the second; but undoubtedly the admitted fact that these letters had been the subject of one forgery made men more inclined to believe that there had been another. However, as investigation proceeded the credit of the Syriac letters

¹ A full and interesting account of the successive acquisitions thus made by the British Museum will be found in Dr. Wright's Preface to the third part of the *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum acquired since the year 1838*, London, 1872. See also an article by Dr. Cureton in the *Quarterly Review*, No. cliii.

decl
Ligh
their
Syri
reco
seve

V
of M
does
writ
is no
one
whic

S
there
to B
the C
to E

also
the t
ledge
with
cover
hims
lated

and t
of ast
chara
under
show

He d
accou
then
the S

are in
likew
our S
none

Of th
he sta
cumc
phras
about
(4)
hereti
VOI

declined, and scholars, such as Lipsius in Germany and Lightfoot in England, who had been once disposed to accept their form as the original, now abandon their defence, and the Syriac letters have lost nearly all their importance in being recognized to be only extracts made from a version of the seven letters.

We shall not delay on (2) an Apology bearing the name of Melito of Sardes, who died about 180. Even if genuine, it does not add much to our knowledge of the times when it was written; but it is highly questionable whether the ascription is not erroneous, for Eusebius appears to have known only one Apology by Melito, and he quotes an extract from it which is not found in the Syriac Apology.

Somewhat more interest attaches to (3) a work of which there had been some previous knowledge—a dialogue ascribed to Bardesanes of Edessa, bearing the title of *The Laws of the Countries*, for the dialogue was known to Eusebius and to Epiphanius under the title *Concerning Fate*, and it has also been made use of in the Clementine Recognitions. Of the teaching of Bardesanes we have scarcely any direct knowledge, but according to trustworthy authorities it was tainted with some form of Gnostic heresy. Even the work now recovered is found to have been penned, not by Bardesanes himself, but by a pupil of his. The subject is one not calculated to exhibit any discordance between the writer's views and those of the Church. His object is to refute the doctrine of astrological fate; that is to say, the doctrine that men's character and conduct are determined by the constellations under which they are born. His method of refutation is to show the power of man's freewill to resist all stellar influences. He displays his geographical knowledge by giving a detailed account of the laws and customs of different countries, and then tells how the Jews, in spite of stars or climates, keep the Sabbath day and circumcise their children, whether they are in Edom or Arabia, Greece or Persia, north or south. So likewise the new race of us Christians, wherever we are, hold our Sunday meetings, keep our weekly fasts, and observe none of the evil customs of the country in which we live. Of these a detailed list is given, of which we only note that he states that those who live among the Jews do not use circumcision. The antiquity of the tract is evidenced by the phrase, 'new race,' applied to the Christians, and what is told about their weekly observances is interesting.

(4) If the last work described is by one branded as a heretic, the next to be mentioned is by one of unimpeachable

orthodoxy—the great Athanasius. It has been long known that it was the custom of the Bishops of Alexandria to issue circular letters announcing the day on which each coming Easter was to be celebrated. The earliest of whom this is told is Dionysius, fragments of such letters being preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vii. 20–22). After the Council of Nicæa had laid down the rule that Easter was to be celebrated on the Sunday following the full moon of the vernal equinox, the announcement of the day was made by the Bishop of Alexandria, where astronomical science was most cultivated. It was known that Athanasius had written Festal letters of this kind. Some fragments of them had been preserved, and some spurious Festal letters in the name of Athanasius had been forged. Montfaucon, the Benedictine editor of his works, had expressed a hope of the recovery of something more trustworthy: ‘fortassis adhuc latent in Oriente, ubi bene multa extant.’

This hope has been fulfilled by Cureton’s publication of an old Syriac translation of these Festal letters, not indeed complete, but still very interesting. Besides its doctrinal teaching it enables us to rectify some small errors in the chronology of the life of Athanasius; his accession to the see is found to have been not in 326, as on the authority of Theodoret had been previously supposed, but not until June 8, 328; and the date of the Council of Sardica has to be altered from 347 to 343.

(5) We come close to the limits we had fixed ourselves in the last of Cureton’s publications described by Lechler, the third part of the *Ecclesiastical History of John of Ephesus*, a Monophysite bishop who lived in the reign of Justinian, and had been employed by him in the conversion of the heathen still numerous in Constantinople and Asia Minor. In this work he had been highly successful, having, as he tells us, baptized 30,000 persons, and built 96 churches. In his later life, during which, like other Monophysites, he had to suffer persecution, he gave his Syrian fellow-countrymen the first Church history in their own language and it was brought down to their own ‘troubled times.’ An interesting piece of contemporary history which he gives is that of the foundation of the Christian Church in Nubia. Assemani had printed in his *Bibliotheca Orientalis* the statement of Bar-Hebraeus, a Syrian writer of the thirteenth century, that Nubia had been converted by Monophysites in the time of Justinian; but he had refused to give credence to a story which seemed to him to have been got up in the interests of heretics. It is, however, quite con-

firm
stor
It a
been
the
pres
her
plan
of th
ding
king
Theo
know
arriv
gove
emp
of th
the n
and,
wort
push
sador
only
site c
(6
of th
but a
plete
ments
impor
reman
confor
ties, w
curren
there
the cu
the ve
by the
1864 p
a Syri
affinit
so exa
which
cott an
as Syn

firmed by the newly recovered authority, which tells a curious story of this planting of Christianity in Nubia in the year 550. It appears that Julianus, an Alexandrian Monophysite, had been inspired with zeal for the conversion of the tribes outside the limits of the Roman empire, and had written to the Empress Theodora, a patroness of the Monophysites, requesting her co-operation. When the emperor was informed of the plan he was eager to join in it, only the missionaries must be of the orthodox faith of the Council of Chalcedon. Accordingly he sent an ambassador with presents to the Nubian king, and also letters to the governor of the Thebaid. But Theodora promptly took her measures, and let the governor know that his head should pay the penalty if Julianus did not arrive before those sent with the emperor's authority. The governor dared not disregard the warning; so he gave the emperor's ambassadors a courteous reception, but told them of the dangers of the desert journey they had to make, and of the necessity of finding the cattle necessary for the journey, and, what was more important and more difficult, really trustworthy guides. While these were being sought Julianus had pushed on, and when after much delay the emperor's ambassadors arrived at their destination they found the king not only converted to Christianity, but pledged to the Monophysite creed.

(6) It does not fall within the plan of this article to speak of the discovery of MSS. of the New Testament text; but any mention of Cureton's publications would be incomplete without saying something as to his publication of fragments of a Syriac translation of the Gospels which plays an important part in modern textual criticism. Tregelles had remarked that the Peshito, or Syriac vulgate text, instead of conforming to the text attested by the oldest Greek authorities, was in tolerably close accordance with that which became current in the fourth century. He ventured then to assert that there must have been an older form of Syriac text, of which the current Peshito is only a later recension. It seemed like the verification of the calculations of Adams and Le Verrier by the discovery of the planet Neptune when Cureton in 1864 published fragments, found among the Nitrian MSS., of a Syriac version of the Gospels, the text of which has strong affinities with that of the older Western MSS. This is so exactly what had been anticipated, that the version with which we have thus been made acquainted is quoted by Westcott and Hort as *Syriaca vetus*, the Peshito being referred to as *Syriaca vulgata*; and in this view they have the adherence

of the majority of New Testament critics. But Syriac scholars find it hard to get over the complete absence of other traces of what is held to be the old Syriac, Mr. Gwilliam, for example, who is preparing for publication an edition of the Peshito Gospels founded on MSS. one of which is as old as the fifth century, not being able to find in the oldest MSS. any indication that their text was substantially different from that now current. It is not unreasonable to hope that some as yet unstudied Syriac documents may become known which will put the solution of this question beyond all controversy. At present the most hopeful source of illustration is a comparison with the text of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, to be mentioned presently, which has been found to exhibit a relationship with the Curetonian text. That Tatian, who resided for some time in the West, should use a Western text is quite natural; but with regard to the relations between his work and the Syriac Gospels there are questions not yet fully determined, into which, therefore, we cannot enter.

V. Next in order comes to be mentioned Tischendorf's success in obtaining the great Sinaitic MS. in 1859. We need not repeat the interesting history which he himself has given of his discovery, since it is given in a tract of his, entitled, *When were our Gospels written?* which has been published by the Religious Tract Society for a shilling, and has obtained a wide circulation. We have declined to enter on the history of the discovery of New Testament MSS., but this one contains besides, as an appendix to the canonical books, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas. It had been known from the testimony of Eusebius that, besides our canonical books, some other writings had, in early times, been admitted into the public reading of some churches. This had been confirmed by the fact that the Alexandrian MS. had been found to contain the two Epistles ascribed to Clement of Rome; and was now further illustrated by the finding of these two early works in a MS. to all appearance intended for church use. The discovery that this new find contained a complete text of the Epistle of Barnabas was the first thing to excite Tischendorf's interest, and the very night when he became acquainted with the MS. he copied out the whole of the epistle. The Greek copies known previously, all derived from a common source, had wanted the first four chapters, for which we had been dependent on a by no means trustworthy Latin version. In one point, however, on which its accuracy had been impugned it turns out to have been quite right. At the end of the fourth chapter Barnabas

sa
ma
tha
dou
and
of t
how
ōs
Gre
the
scri
tha

MS
Epi
othe
lacu
Epi
Hop
auth
We
but
and
reco
pres
cont
Cler

have
ritie
we
by H
Sern
read
esca
volu
Sept
care
Wes
cipat
(in
polit
the
sale
Orie

says: 'Let us take heed lest we be found, as it is written, many called but few chosen.' Many found it hard to believe that so early a document as the Epistle of Barnabas undoubtedly is, should cite St. Matthew's Gospel as Scripture, and Credner in 1832 suggested that the 'Sicut scriptum est' of the Latin must be a gloss of the translator. It turns out, however, that the Latin translator faithfully represents the *ὡς γέγραπται* of the Greek. In another passage, however, the Greek has enabled us to correct a faulty reading of the Latin, the words 'sicut dicit filius Dei' being now seen to be a transcriber's error for 'sicut decet filios Dei,' and the result being that a supposed saying of our Lord disappears.

VI. Mention has just been made that the Alexandrian MS. of the New Testament contained the two Greek Epistles ascribed to Clement of Rome; and until lately no other copy of these letters was known. Besides sundry small lacunæ in the MS., one whole leaf was lost in the First Epistle, and about the latter half of the Second Epistle. Hopes that had been raised of discovering an independent authority for the text were more than once disappointed. Wetstein in 1752 published two Syriac Clementine Epistles, but they proved to be a different work from the Greek Epistles, and are evidently by a later author. Tischendorf thought to recover the desired authority in a palimpsest heard of as preserved at Ferrara; but he found on examination that it contained merely a legendary relation of the martyrdom of Clement, and was of no value.

Strange to say, after hope had been almost given up, we have come into possession, not of one, but of two, new authorities for the text of these Epistles, which were discovered, we may say, almost simultaneously. The first was found by Bryennius, a learned Greek divine, Metropolitan then of Serræ, now of Nicomedia. It illustrates what we have already said about the possibility of treasures of an old library escaping notice, that the library in which Bryennius found the volume containing these Clementine Epistles, that of the Holy Sepulchre at Constantinople, had already been visited and carefully examined between 1845 and 1853 by more than one Western scholar, none of whom were so fortunate as to anticipate Bryennius's discovery. About a year after Bryennius (in 1875) had published an edition of the Constantino-politan MS., most creditable to his learning and accuracy, the second authority unexpectedly came to light. At the sale in Paris, early in 1876, of the MSS. of the deceased Orientalist, Julius Mohl, the Cambridge University Library

became possessed of a Syriac MS. which was supposed to be only a copy of the Philoxenian version of the New Testament. But on examination it was found to contain also these two Clementine Letters ; but not, as in the Alexandrian MS., as an appendix to the canonical books, but taking their place with the Catholic Epistles and before the Pauline Letters. The pericope divisions also show that the transcriber completely treated these epistles as canonical Scripture. The two new sources have been made use of by Bishop Lightfoot in the appendix, which he published in 1877, to the edition of the Epistles of Clement which he had brought out eight years before. The newly discovered matter has thus been made so generally known to English readers that we abstain from enlarging on many points on which it would be interesting to dwell, and content ourselves with mentioning that the so-called Second Epistle, which had previously been known to be of different authorship from the First Epistle, now turns out not to be an epistle at all, but a homily intended for church reading.

VII. The year after the publication of Bryennius's *Clement* a book was published in Venice which in great measure reveals to us a work of the second century which had long disappeared, and had been the subject of much controversy. We learn from Eusebius and from Epiphanius that Tatian, the disciple of Justin Martyr, composed a harmony of the Gospels, which he called *Diatessaron* ; but neither of these authorities appears to have had personal acquaintance with the work. We have reason to believe that it was extensively used in Syria, and was in fact the form in which the Gospel history was commonly read in the churches where Syriac was spoken. Theodoret tells that he found in his own diocese two hundred of these books in church use, which he took away and replaced by the Four Gospels. He states that the *Diatessaron* did not contain our Lord's genealogies, and he regarded the omission as made with heretical intent. This was about all that was known of the *Diatessaron* on really ancient testimony. There were those to whom it seemed incredible that so early a writer as Tatian should have known our Four Gospels, and attributed to them such pre-eminent authority as to endeavour to weave them into a harmony. 'The word "*Diatessaron*" must not be supposed to imply *four* sources, or, if it does, the fourth must not be supposed to be St. John's Gospel, but some other Gospel now lost.' Nor were they convinced though Dionysius Bar-Salibi, a Syriac writer of the twelfth century, made known to the West by Assemani, states

tha
men
com
Ligh
weak
the v
he w
had
that
cent
the
beco
it fro
the t
havin
been
lost ;
trans
is lo
St.
origi

T
to a
unde
bears
and
union
the F
as we
inhab
Arme
with
richer
where
their
In 18
trans
amon
few i
that
lation
Auch
Mech
a Ger
the C

that Ephrem Syrus had in the fourth century written a commentary on the *Diatessaron*, and that this harmony had commenced with 'In the beginning was the Word.' Bishop Lightfoot, in the *Contemporary Review* for 1877, exposed the weakness of the pretexts on which the obvious inferences from the word '*Diatessaron*' had been evaded. But at the time he wrote, though he was not then aware of it, a new witness had made his appearance. It is in the Armenian language that this testimony has been preserved. Early in the fourth century the Gospel was preached in Armenia by Gregory the Illuminator. In the following century Armenian had become a written language; the Bible was translated into it from the Syriac; and soon after, active work went on in the translation of Syriac and Greek works, over six hundred having been translated before the year 450. In this way have been preserved some writings which otherwise would have been lost; and it may be mentioned in passing that an Armenian translation of the 'Chronicle' of Eusebius, the Greek of which is lost, gives us help in determining whether and how far St. Jerome, in his Latin translation, departed from his original.

The West owes its knowledge of these Armenian writings to a colony of learned Armenians who in 1715 came to Venice under the leading of Mechithar, whose name the society still bears. Mechithar, desirous to introduce Western learning and culture among his countrymen, had been anxious for union with Rome; but he met with so much opposition in the East that at length he came with his scholars to Venice, as we have said. There the Senate gave him the then uninhabited island of St. Lazzaro, where, with the help of rich Armenians in Constantinople, he built a monastery, provided with a printing press and a library, which now contains the richest collection of Armenian manuscripts to be found anywhere. His successors followed in his footsteps, and through their press theological literature has made many acquisitions. In 1836 issued from their press four volumes of an Armenian translation of the exegetical writings of Ephrem Syrus, and among them his Commentary on the *Diatessaron*; but so few in the West are acquainted with the Armenian language that this remained practically unknown until a Latin translation of the Commentary, which had been made in 1841 by Aucher, one of the most diligent and most learned of the Mechitarists, was revised, and at length in 1876 published by a German scholar, Moesinger. There can be no doubt that the Commentary thus made known is that which Bar-Salibi

has described, and that its author was Ephrem Syrus. It is clearly a Commentary on a Gospel Harmony, and it seems unreasonable to question that that Harmony was what was known as the *Diatessaron*, the authorship of which is ascribed to Tatian. It is beyond doubt that this Harmony was based exclusively on our Four Gospels, that according to St. John being largely made use of. Apparently it did not contain the genealogies; but we find nothing to countenance Theodoret's suspicion that there had been any heretical motive for the omission. Questions have been raised as to the original language of the '*Diatessaron*,' and as to its relations with the Curetonian Syriac Gospels already mentioned, which it would be out of place here to discuss.

VIII. Here may briefly be noticed a find of which Lechler makes no mention, but which deserves to be recorded. The attacks on Christianity made by Porphyry and others were so offensive to Christian readers that, as we have said, not only have the works themselves perished, but even the refutations of them have seldom been preserved. One large fragment of a work containing heathen objections and replies to them has recently been recovered. The author's name is given in the title as Macarius Magnes; internal evidence fixes the date of composition about A.D. 400, and there was a Macarius bishop at that time, to whom the work has reasonably been ascribed. It had, indeed, a very narrow escape of being lost. It was cited in the Iconoclastic controversy in the eighth century, and Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople at the time, who had never heard of the work before, procured a copy with great difficulty. His account will be found in *Spicilegium Solesmense*, i. 305. After that, scarcely any notice seems to have been taken of the work until near the end of the sixteenth century, when the Jesuit Turrianus found a copy of it in St. Mark's Library at Venice, and used some passages in controversy. Then the book disappeared, and it is quite lately that what may very possibly be the same copy was discovered at Athens, through the exertions of the French School in that city. It was published in Paris in 1876. It contains, as we have stated, a collection of heathen objections and replies to them. It is a question whether the objections have been simply taken from a heathen book or whether they are stated by the writer in his own words. In any case it may be presumed that they represent assaults on Christianity then current. The objector is evidently intimately acquainted with the New Testament; and this gives especial interest to the work as showing what were

the points which were then felt as presenting most difficulty to the unconverted. The answerer frequently escapes the attack by methods of allegorical interpretation in which a modern reader is not disposed to follow him.

IX. Syriac literature offers us another gain which has not yet been fully utilized, in a translation of the Church History of Eusebius. The oldest Greek MSS. of that work are not older than the tenth century; the Syriac translation is not later than the fifth, and must have been made within a hundred years of the time when the work was written. It need not, therefore, be said what valuable help this translation offers to an editor of the Greek text. Among the MSS. described by Cureton is one containing the first five books of this translation, written in the year 933. But in St. Petersburg there is a MS. containing other portions of the same version, and dated A.D. 462. There is, besides, in the Mechitarist Library an Armenian version of this Syriac translation. Professor Wright is known to be at work on the Syriac version, and Merx on the Armenian; but we have still to wait for the complete result of their labours. Meanwhile it has been possible to remove suspicions whether certain passages found in the current text of Eusebius might not be later additions, by showing that they were read by the Syriac translator about the end of the fourth century. On the other hand, it has been possible to make some isolated corrections of the Greek text. Thus, for example, in the list which Eusebius gives of the works of Melito of Sardes is one called 'the Key.' Pitra, in his *Spicilegium Solesmense*, published a Latin work, which he fully accepted as being a translation of the *Clavis* of Melito. Though the claim was acknowledged by some, it has been abundantly shown that the work edited by Pitra is really a mediæval production, in which works were made use of centuries later than Melito. What was the subject of Melito's work remained uncertain. But it is an important fact that this title, 'the Key,' is absent from the Syriac version, whether the translator accidentally omitted it or did not find it in his text.

X. Under this head Lechler gives a full description of the early work known as the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, a copy of which was found by Bryennius in the same volume which contained the Epistles of Clement already noticed by us. This new find has excited so much interest, and has given birth to so copious a literature, that it would not be possible to treat of it adequately in the space that remains to us. Nor are we under any temptation so to lengthen this

article, since the Didaché has so recently been the subject of investigation in this Review.

XI. Since Lechler wrote, a new source has been opened, from which we may expect valuable accessions to our knowledge. Volney tells us in his travels that in 1778

'the Arabs found in a subterranean place near the site of the ancient Memphis fifty volumes written in a language which they understood not. They were inclosed in a case of sycamore wood, and were highly perfumed. The Arabs offered them for sale to a French merchant, but he refused to purchase them all. He fortunately, however, bought one, while the Arabs consumed the rest, cutting them up, and using them for tobacco, for which they served as an admirable substitute on account of their pleasant odour.'¹

What we have lost in this way it is impossible to tell, but the MS. which survived proved to be as old as the second or third century, containing a list of the workmen employed on the canals connecting the Lake Moeris with the Nile. Since then many Greek papyri have been from time to time recovered. A large collection was purchased in 1877 by the German consul at Alexandria, and sent to Berlin; but the greatest treasure of all was gained about four years ago by the Austrian Archduke Renier, who, when travelling in Egypt, purchased a vast quantity of papyri in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Persian, Arabic, Coptic, as well as in the old Egyptian character. This mass of documents has been deposited in the Imperial Library at Vienna, and is undergoing examination by thoroughly competent scholars. Until they have had time to complete their scrutiny, and to publish its results, it would be premature to attempt to count our gains. Probably a large part of the recovered documents will turn out to be of no importance, and classical literature is likely to profit more than theological. But Church history may be largely benefited by the recovery of even quite secular documents. Among these Fayûm MSS., for example, is a collection of edicts and other State documents which will help to put on a firm basis our chronology of early imperial times, even if it should throw no other light on ecclesiastical history. One little fragment from the Fayûm collection has already made some little stir. It is a third-century copy of that part of the Gospel story which relates our Lord's prediction of Peter's denial—St. Matt. xxvi. 30–34, Mark xiv. 26–30. But the verbal differences from our present Gospels are so great

¹ Professor G. T. Stokes, in an article on the Fayûm Manuscripts, *Expositor*, May 1885.

that Bickell, a Roman Catholic professor at Innsbruck, holds that it was not taken from them, but preserves a fragment of an earlier Gospel. In this view he has found some distinguished scholars to agree with him; but Dr. Hort has given what seem to us quite satisfactory reasons for thinking that it is no more than a free quotation from the Gospels we have. Among the Coptic papyri are an original history of the Diocletian persecution as conducted in Egypt, and a Monophysite account of the proceedings of the Council of Chalcedon. The Greek papyri are said to contain portions of St. Cyril's works, and others which we will not delay to enumerate.

We have said enough to show how very large has been the discovery of ancient documents in the course of the present reign; and that there is good reason to hope that we have not yet come to the end of such discoveries. Two remarks occur to us in conclusion. One is that while the new discoveries have shown the groundlessness of some suspicions that had been expressed as to the antiquity of some of our sacred books, nothing has turned up tending the other way. The second remark is how much our knowledge has gained though the missionary exertions of the Church which, even before the destruction of Jerusalem, the Apostolic seer beheld embracing men of all 'nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues.' From this wide diffusion of Christianity it has resulted that what has been lost in one place has been preserved in another; and we have seen how from these different tongues, Greek, Latin, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, united testimony is borne to the history of the progress of that kingdom in which all nations are one.

SHORT NOTICES.

Social Aspects of Christianity. By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D. D.C.L., Canon of Westminster and Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. (London and Cambridge: Macmillan and Co. 1887.)

CANON WESTCOTT gives us a series of very able sermons preached in Westminster Abbey. The place for which they were prepared has had, as he tells us, much to do with the choice of his subject. Indeed he is so desirous that this should be remembered that he extracts from a former volume a passage of much beauty in which he describes the effect of 'the Abbey' and its vast congregations upon one called to minister there. We can well conceive it when the heart of the

preacher is so tender and his mind so rich in far-reaching thought as Dr. Westcott's. But we would add to his description of the inspirations of the Abbey the hint that it has also its temptations. The visitor to this glorious church who permits his mind to think of something besides the national history which its monuments and inscriptions commemorate, will confess that in the visible aspect of the place the National Campo Santo somewhat overpowers the church. The crowded statues, with William Pitt dominating their host from the west door, hide from all but the most determined lookers upward the solemn vistas of the roof; much more is the same thing true when the place is transformed into a court chapel for a jubilee. In the same way the earthly history and secular associations, striking as they are to the imagination, might, even because they are so striking, obscure to the thought those eternal verities, independent of time or place, of which a church is the home. The secular influence—secular we mean in the highest and most pure, but therefore subtlest, form—which Westminster Abbey exercises has been before now evident in the case of its highest dignitaries. And could we imagine so lofty a function falling to our lot as that of giving a charge to a dean and canon of Westminster, we should bid him not only keep his heart open to the story of glorious English life, of which his church is the shrine, and to the appeal of those crowds of English faces from all quarters of the world which assemble there, but also to guard himself against losing any part of the spirituality of his message among these imposing but earthly surroundings. How far Canon Westcott has held his presentation of the Gospel high and free from all that is secular, and how far even he has yielded to the influence of the national Pantheon, will appear from the short account we can give of his eloquent work.

He is of opinion that when we regard the main features of the thought of our time we find that the interests of men are passing from the individual to the society. This basis is protected from the narrowness (may the paradox be permitted) of extravagant breadth by the foundation which the author is careful to lay in the person of the Lord. So long as this origin of all social truth and duty is remembered there is no danger of setting either of them in an unhealthy and unreal opposition to the claims of the individual life. For the fact that in the personality of Christ our social obligations find their centre, reminds us that our own personality must advance toward closer union with Him in the same degree in which our altruistic duties to His brethren and ours are performed. Indeed it is of little moment whether you begin with the individual or with the society. If the individual would cultivate his own nature fully and truly he must act outwards upon the society, and the society cannot be what it ought to be unless the persons who compose it develop their mental and moral powers to the full. No moralist of any age or tendency could entirely forget this double aspect of our life, so obvious is it in the very conditions of our existence. It may well be, we allow, that one aspect or the other shall become prominent at particular times, and that in our time the social should claim special

attention. But we cannot make this concession without recalling the fact that so acute an observer as Stuart Mill believed that individuality ran special dangers of being overwhelmed under the mass of modern humanity, and needed at this time special protection. Nowhere could it obtain such protection as from the eternal importance which the Incarnation of the Son of God, followed up by His divine words, attaches to our separate lives.

But Canon Westcott calls us for the present to consider our social relations, and we are well content to follow his guidance. The first of them which presents itself is that of the Family. 'We are not made to live alone : ' true. 'The Family and not the individual is the unit of mankind' (p. 21) : is that true? Well, it is certainly the case that the individual is not an absolute being but exists in relation, and that the primary relationships are those of the family. But to say that the family and not the individual is the unit would seem to us strangely like denying that the individual is the individual.

'The Family,' Canon Westcott says with equal truth and beauty, 'is not only an expression of Divine law. It is, under the conditions of earth, in some sense a reflection of the Divine nature. Every Family, every Fatherhood, derives that in virtue of which it is from the One Father' (p. 23). But whether he is equally right in naming those points in family life which are to be regarded as reflections of the divine nature we are doubtful. 'A perfect Family includes three primary relations, those of husband and wife, of parent and child, of brothers and sisters.' By these last words, we may remark, we are to understand, as the sequel of Canon Westcott's argument shows, not the relation of brothers to sisters, but that of brothers to brothers and sisters, and *vice versa*, or, in one word, brotherhood. But when we are bidden to trace in the relations of husband and wife an earthly reflection of the divine nature we must needs remember that Marriage is ever treated in Holy Scripture not as the reflection of the divine nature in Itself, but as the pattern of the divine connexion with humanity. So taken it is an image sufficiently full of sacred meaning to justify us in calling Marriage a great sacrament, if not in the technical sense of theologians, yet in the broad meaning of those who trace the impress of God upon the world. Yet it does not make Marriage a reflection of the divine nature in Itself. Canon Westcott is on surer ground for finding among earthly relationships the image of the divine nature Itself when he says that Fatherhood is the original sacrament of authority ; sonship of reverence and obedience. And from this follows 'Brotherhood, the original sacrament of equality. But this divine equality is . . . widely different from that external equality which men have looked for in some reconstruction of the world. It is inherent and permanent ; it is manifested in variety ; it is consummated in sacrifice' (p. 28). We restrain ourselves with difficulty from further quotation under this head that we may not leave ourselves quite without room to indicate the further developments of social life in which Canon Westcott traces the divine plan.

The Nation grows from the Family. It grows by God's ordinance and no man's plan or intention. 'All attempts to explain the origin

of states by a primitive contract between their members are idle fictions' (p. 37). The life of the Nation, with its fruits and proofs in language, law, government, and religion, are facts into the possession of which we are born, not manufactures of our ingenuity. To display to us the teaching of this great fact and clear our minds for its due reception is the work of Canon Westcott's sermon upon the Nation :—

'The Nation no less than the Family is organized and controlled by an inherent authority. Through whatever instruments the authority may be administered, it is in itself not of man but of God. Authority is not created but recognized, even in a successful revolution. Authority may be graced or obscured by the character of him who wields it, but essentially it can receive no glory and suffer no loss from man' (p. 43).

And the Nation leads us forward to the Race.

'We find that we are truer men, truer Christians, in proportion as we recognize that the Nation is for the loyal citizen a revelation, blurred and mutilated it may be, but still a revelation of the original will of God. . . . But we cannot rest here. As the teaching of the Family leads us to the idea of the Nation, so the teaching of the Nation leads us while the ages go forward, to the idea of the Race. While the ages go forward : for the old Roman had but one word for stranger and enemy. The Greeks sharply separated themselves from all other peoples as essentially inferior. The Hebrews, alone of ancient peoples, in this respect true children of Abraham, though in others the most exclusive of all, provided from the first for the admission of strangers to a full share of their most sacred privileges' (p. 52).

Canon Westcott makes many wise observations upon the practical development of our consciousness of relations to humanity out of our consciousness of national union. The spirit of domination in which a nation assumes its own habits to be the best, and would impose them upon other peoples, has its reaction in the discovery that other peoples have customs and characteristics admirable in their way though different from ours. When this conviction has been taken into the mind the result is apt to be a contempt for those insular prejudices which once possessed us, and an attempt to copy those foreign fashions which we have learnt to admire ; and upon the further discovery that this is ridiculous, some become citizens of the world, of no nation in particular. We can recognize the truth of this analysis at any continental *table d'hôte*. But through all these passing phases of mind the great idea of a kingdom of God built not upon forgetfulness or neglect of national claims or national history, makes its way. 'Yes ; the work of God will prevail. The universal claims of man upon man, the cause of humanity, will prevail, not perhaps through those to whom it was first committed, and certainly not without suffering. But the issue of the cause is not for us. The cause itself is.' And so our teacher bids us recognize in the idea of the Race as in that of the Nation a revelation of God, an impress of His mind upon human history, which men may regard, accept, and use, or which, at their own peril, they may ignore. The great work of the preacher in treating of the Race as of the Family or the Nation is to divest our minds of the carelessness and narrowness which leave us

either v
which a
shone i
be trust
without
all natio
to all ap
appreh
revealin

We
change
what he
treatme
cases hi
instituti
which i
that Go
to take
Church
impress
the mis
to touch
its sacr
moral o
among
Church
obscure
visible
prophet
speak th
of the W
example
to be '
tion.'
the con
can we
sentime
divine i
plain w
not wh
settled
and the
having
religiou
of suffer
ceptions
ticular i
he cont
sure tha
our min

either without any thoughts upon the subject or else with thoughts which are prejudiced and perverted. When once the great idea has shone in upon the mind in its reality as the institution of God, it may be trusted to produce its proper effect. St. Paul was content to leave without comment his declaration that 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the whole earth.' Prior to all application of this great truth, and more necessary by far, is the apprehension of the fact itself as revealed to us by God and as revealing Him.

We pass from the Race to the Church. And here we find a change in Canon Westcott's treatment of his subject which places what he has to say upon the Church quite out of parallelism with his treatment of the Family, the Nation, and the Race. For in these cases his care has been to teach us that in each several instance the institution is of divine authority, to separate it from other ideas with which it mingles in our minds, and leave us with the consciousness that God has made us members of a Family, a Nation, and a Race to take in this divine lesson and use it. But in the case of the Church he does not show by what signs we are to recognize it or impress on us the responsibility of belonging to it or guard us against the mistakes which obscure it to our minds. He does not 'propose to touch on the organization of the Church, its ministry, its services, its sacraments;' but 'simply to suggest a few thoughts as to its moral office, as to its universal mission, and as to its embodiment among ourselves.' His thoughts upon the social mission of the Church are extremely beautiful, even though sometimes a little obscure. It is the office of the Church to enable men in things visible to see the sacramental image of what is divine, and to be 'the prophet of the eternal in the light of creation;' it is her office to speak the will of God to successive ages and to be 'the Interpreter of the World in the light of the Incarnation;' she is to hold up Christ's example and present His gifts for men's comfort and admonition, and to be 'the quickener and sustainer of life in the light of the Redemption.' And Canon Westcott treats in a kind and thoughtful spirit the controversy upon the national position of the Church. But we can well conceive that many might listen with approval to these sentiments into whose minds the conception of the Church as a divine institution has never sunk. Canon Westcott makes it quite plain what the Family is, what the Nation is, what the Race is, but not what the Church is. He has not been satisfied to leave unsettled for any listener the question whether the Family, the Nation, and the Race are of divine origin or are merely human creations having certain functions which it is desirable they should perform religiously and well. He warns us against the danger in these cases of suffering the definiteness of the idea to melt away into other conceptions true in their own way but insufficient substitutes for the particular idea of the divine society of which he treats. Why, then, is he content to speak of the Church's functions without first making sure that the idea of the Church as a divine institution is well fixed in our minds, and without reminding us of the danger we run of losing the

distinctness of our conception of the Church amidst the other forms of social life? Surely there is far greater danger in these days of an imperfect grasp of the conception of the Church than of a failure to perceive the idea of the Nation; a far greater peril of allowing the supposed claims of charity and largeness of mind to put aside our duty to God's institution of the Church than there is of suffering a cosmopolitan breadth to thrust out of sight our duty to the Nation.

We could willingly dwell upon the interesting discourses which Canon Westcott devotes to the efforts at organizing social life which the history of Christianity records. The life and work of St. Francis of Assisi, which have proved for six hundred years and more a never-failing spring of love and beauty to every one who has contemplated them, lose nothing of their charm in Dr. Westcott's sympathetic treatment. And it is a truly suggestive reading of history which sets beside the picture of St. Francis as its companion, and at the same time its contrast, that of George Fox. For as the one subjects the individual life to God's voice speaking to man through nature and humanity and bidding him lose himself, so the other hears God's voice in the single soul and works upon humanity through the units which compose it. Each work failed at last through its neglect or its imperfect grasp of the truth which the other embodies. And might we not extend the same observation to those larger movements in the midst of which the Franciscans and the Society of Friends had their birth; and say that Romanism and the Reformation have their strength respectively in the ideas of community and individualism, and their weakness in the excess and exclusiveness with which each holds to its own view?

We understand Canon Westcott in his concluding sermon to propose the establishment of a new society: a 'fellowship of brethren and sisters of the common hope;' freer than the Franciscans, less self-conscious than the Friends. It is to be English, to be comprehensive, to be social, to be open, to be rational, to be spiritual. A noble conception; but we cannot see that any such fellowship could possess these various qualifications in a higher and more distinctive degree than the divine society of the Church. And if we be told that the Church is too wide to afford that distinct sense of purpose and mutual support which a smaller society can offer to its members, we reply that in these days belief in the Church and the determination to embody that belief in the life sets a difference only too sharp between those who hold it and the secular society around them, and unites them of itself in a company which, alas! is by no means too large for distinctness of purpose and action.

Faculties and Difficulties for Belief and Disbelief. By the Rev. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Canon of Christ Church and Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology; sometime Vicar of Bromsgrove. (London: Rivingtons, 1887.)

THIS title would perhaps lead us to expect a formal treatise on the internal evidences of religion. The volume does not quite bear that character. It is the result of a request to Dr. Paget that he should publish a volume of sermons. In giving effect to this

suggesti
devoted
us to wa
culties w
out its c
are very
two den
of Pasto
logical
anthrop
better th

We
this ton
as indic
adapted
hold in
not like
assumes
dominat
victory i
the soul
to make

The
belief in
author's
on the I
Dublin
attitude
neglect
of it is t
of Chris
rejected
refuses
Christia
certain
stricture
downwa
against
disbelie
and forc
Whately
of a fut
were no
expresse
was nei
mental
as the s
a largen
unbelie
bilities

VOL.

suggestion he has arranged the discourses in two classes—the first devoted to the facts of our mental and moral nature which compel us to want the Gospel and fit us to receive it ; the second to the difficulties which a mind that positively rejects the Gospel will meet in living out its creed of negation. The author acknowledges that the sermons are very loosely consecutive. Still they fall without forcing into these two denominations. And the fact that the discourses of the Professor of Pastoral Theology should class themselves easily under so psychological a title indicates to us the introspective or, so to speak, anthropological character which theology is taking in our day, even better than if the work had been a deliberate treatise.

We are very far from complaining that Dr. Paget should adopt this tone in sermons which, coming from him, will be regarded as indicating the kind of pastoral instruction which he holds to be adapted to the times. We are well convinced that belief has a stronghold in the necessary tendencies of human nature from which it is not likely to be displaced. And though man's faculty of disbelief assumes in certain cases, and even in certain classes, the air of a dominating principle which must carry all before it, yet when its victory is gained and it seeks to rest it will find hostile powers within the soul which will seem to have waited for the hour of its triumph to make rebellious protest against it.

The reader will notice the presence in the title of the term Disbelief instead of the more usual word Unbelief. This indicates the author's acceptance of a principle which he adopts from the Lectures on the Efficacy of Prayer of the present Provost of Trinity College, Dublin : that it is usually impossible practically to take up the attitude of unbelief when we take that term to express a practical neglect of a subject founded on an uncertainty whether what is said of it is true or false. Unbelief, therefore, which leaves the problem of Christianity unsolved and the whole question in abeyance, is rejected in Dr. Paget's analysis as having no right to exist. It refuses the demand of Christianity on the life and so denies the Christian Creed, without justification for the denial in a mental certainty that the Creed is false. No doubt in logic this is a just stricture on unbelief. But how much Christian teaching from the Bible downwards, addressed both to the mind and the affections, is directed against the position of those who either believe or at least do not disbelieve, yet act as if they believed not ! They reduce the volume and force of their belief to suit their habits and desires. Archbishop Whately was wont to illustrate the position of unbelief by the notions of a future state prevalent among the Greeks and Romans. They were not sure whether there was any future life or not, and they expressed this uncertainty by a conception of future existence which was neither quite real nor quite unreal, but shadowy. Such is the mental state of many nominal adherents of Christianity. No doubt as the social censure upon absolute disbelief grows more lenient and a larger weight of example encourages men to profess it, practical unbelief will more easily pass into formal disbelief. But the possibilities of the former condition are too well rooted in human nature

to allow us to suppose that it will ever disappear, or that encouragements to carry into practice a faith which lies dormant, or to improve into earnestness a faith which is weak, will cease to be needed.

Dr. Paget begins at the true beginning of all reflection on man's inward life—with his personality, his self; and first in the action of the intellect. He shows how the great Christian ideas of sin, of eternal life, and of God, demand for their acceptance a realization on our own part of our personal existence. It is a great mistake, he tells us, to think that every one realizes his personality as a matter of course. We may very easily forget it, and lose the thought of ourselves in that of external things and of the mass of humanity. But as the sense of what we are in ourselves grows clear to us we learn how different we are from what we should wish ourselves to be; we long for a larger life than that which this world gives us, and, above all, we discern our need of God as at once the cause and origin of our personality, and the hope and help of its improvement.

A second sermon upon the virtue of self-assertion follows. It treats of the self-assertion of the will, taking for its example of moral strength and determination the ever fresh story of Abraham's sacrifice. The third treats of the social instinct. And here we have an opportunity of comparing the mental attitude of the Oxford Professor with that of his accomplished senior at Cambridge, whose sermons at Westminster we have just passed in review. We trust we have not shown ourselves insensible to the merit of Professor Westcott's treatment of social life, but we shall confess that in some ways we prefer Dr. Paget's. In the first place, he regards social life as issuing from the instincts of the individual, looks on personal existence as the primary question, and all true recognition of social duty as dependent on personal virtues and sympathies. And in the second place he shows how our sympathies, which receive their best satisfaction here not in the crowd, but in the home, can find their true sphere only in the Church of God. 'I believe in the Communion of Saints. This is the answer of the Christian Church. She and she alone still clings to the hope and promise of a fellowship and sympathy which shall be at once deeper than any depth which a man can fathom in his own soul, and wider than the world itself; a brotherhood into which the most ignorant and outcast and sinful may through penitence find entrance—a brotherhood in which the most sensitive and thoughtful and exacting soul shall never feel or fear the touch of cruelty or stupidity, but ever be led on from height to height, from strength to strength, from glory to glory, by the answer of a love which is never out of sight, and yet never can be outstripped. . . But if thus we find the unlooked-for blessing of mutual trust growing, we know not how, out of our common allegiance to any earthly object, how can we measure the love which might spread from heart to heart if all were wholly set upon the selfsame Lord who ever pours towards all the selfsame everlasting Love? We shall better understand what the Communion of Saints may be in proportion as we can give our hearts, our strength, our lives to Him who gave Himself for us; to Him who, since He was

lifted
them

show
able
while
of li
It is
selve
have
our
desp
or c
wort
aspe
deve
is tr
disc
forc
con
will
vict
are
beli
afte
vati
you
ther
inte
or h
whi
may
smo
by
vict
que
is t
den
who
gat
-cut
wh

cor
and
he
tha
tha
Th
cal

lifted up from the earth, alone can draw all to Himself, and link them in the one sufficient sympathy of one unending Love.'

The sermon upon the 'Reasonableness of Life' is designed to show how a conviction that 'the main lines of human life are reasonable and righteous' necessarily leads us to belief in a life to come, while, on the other hand, the doubt or disbelief in the reasonableness of life is a suspicion which we ought not to allow to enter our minds. It is of the nature of criminality. 'We have no right to say to ourselves or to others that our humanity is naturally vile or brutal. We have no right even in thought so to jeer at ourselves as to imagine our life to be unreal and meaningless, a thing to be mocked at and despised, its interests and issues held in the relentless grip of a blind or cruel force.' These words start a subject which it would be well worth Dr. Paget's while to treat at length and weigh in all its aspects, but which is not exhausted by the paragraphs which he has devoted to it here. Have we any right to say that any belief which is true is criminal? Suppose that a man did become convinced by discourse of reason that our life is in the grip of a blind and cruel force, what is he to do? Can he by mere force of will dismiss the conviction as criminal from his mind and substitute another? You will say to him that true is not a term which can be used of a conviction which is morally degrading. But he is likely to reply that we are imperfect judges of what is morally degrading, and that many beliefs which have appeared to very wise men in that light have afterwards prevailed and proved in the long run to be far more elevating than those which they supplanted. And if you once allow yourself to act upon the theory that what is true may be criminal, there is no knowing where you will stop. You may call men in the interests of morality not merely to reject the theory that man is vile or brutal, but to support this or that organization in Church or State which your education has led you to think morally necessary. You may persuade yourself not merely that it is necessary for you to smother your own conviction as immoral or degrading, but to hinder by force, even to the infliction of death, the propagation of such convictions by others. So a man might argue in favour of dismissing all questions of reasonableness or rightness when the question is what is true. On the other hand, it seems undoubted that moral tendency has its weight in determining belief, and still more in deciding whether it is our duty to propagate it. The pursuit of truth is obligatory only because it is part of the code of human morality, and it cuts its own foundation from under it when it demands to be followed when it teaches what is immoral.

In the sermon upon the 'Love of Beauty in Nature,' Dr. Paget confesses his obligation to Dr. Mozley's great discourse upon Nature, and to Mr. St. J. Tyrwhitt's *Natural Theology of Natural Beauty*; but he has made their thoughts his own. His treatment rests on the thought that our perception of beauty in nature is inseparable from a conviction that the Power which made nature beautiful knows what beauty is. The sermon on 'Beauty in Art' might, we think, have been better called a sermon on beauty in human life. The wondrous contrast of

the Messiah as the King in His beauty with the Messiah who hath no form nor comeliness does indeed give a law to any art which pretends to a comprehensive grasp of true beauty. But a more important fact is that it gives a law for human life, which vainly seeks for beauty in rejecting the stern facts amid which it must live, and finds true beauty only in endurance. Such a reading of the purport of this sermon would by no means render superfluous the fine discourse which follows upon 'Beauty in Character.' The sermon upon the 'Place of the Intellect' has a special interest from its references to Dr. Pusey, who seems to share with Dr. Mozley the chief place in Dr. Paget's affectionate reverence.

But we must pass on to say a few words, before we conclude, upon the second part of Dr. Paget's work, which concerns itself with the difficulties of disbelief. If the reader expects under this title any formal statement of the intellectual difficulties which the creed of negation must face in framing a life in accordance with its dreary articles, he will find himself disappointed. There is no such formal statement in the book, but a series of excellent discourses upon the fitness of Christianity to cure the woes of the human soul. That upon the 'Miracle of Repair' recalls to us the work of Professor Drummond.¹ 'It seems certain that below the level of the simplest life, recovery and repair are effected by processes analogous at least to those which we may trace in man' (p. 175). And so Dr. Paget argues, 'in the moral and spiritual life of mankind there has been achieved a work of repair and renewal which at once resembles and utterly transcends the highest and best ordered methods of the body's renewal.' And those who are able to contemplate with the eye of faith the contrast between Christianity and heathenism, and regard the high hopes and spiritual peace of the Christian creed as so much undoubted gain, will accept the analogy as well justified. But, as the recent work of Mr. Cotter Morison shows, the disbeliever will see in all this supposed repair only a vain appearance of amendment, which is of no moral value and less than none. And even if the reader were but a doubter instead of a disbeliever, we can well think that Dr. Paget's estimate of repair and gain would become shadowy and uncertain in the very proportion in which absolute trust was wanting. The argument depends so much upon values which only exist for faith that it would not possess any overwhelming power for the work of restoring a shaken belief. But, indeed, in the succeeding sermon upon 'The Reality of Grace' Dr. Paget shows himself quite conscious that he is 'moving upon ground which may be resolutely denied' to him. And he furnishes an answer not indeed impossible to reject, but such as a reverent observer of life will find sufficient. Grace in itself cannot be seen, but neither, as Bishop Berkeley argues, can Force; the one must be studied in its effects as well as the other. And these

¹ See also an eloquent passage which forms the peroration of a lecture by Sir James Paget on 'The repair and reproduction of injured and lost parts' (*Lectures on Surgical Pathology delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons by Sir James Paget, Bart.*, 4th edition, London, 1876. Lecture vii. p. 128).

effect
the I

ture,
discl
hum
ages
and
there
to th
thing

T
chan
virtu
and
most
which
ever
faire
in g
the
Chri
judg
mou
early
palm
tive.
how
men
pow
mon
disb
of th
itself
best
of t
for
find
with
of t

Re

Th
gati
'T
hel
lite
wri
sug

effects, the phenomena of Grace, are stated in the striking words of the Dean of St. Paul's :—

‘It seems to me that the exultation apparent in early Christian literature, beginning with the Apostolic epistles, at the prospect now at length disclosed within the bounds of a sober hope, of a great moral revolution in human life—that the rapturous confidence which pervades those Christian ages that at last the routine of vice and sin has met its match, that a new and astonishing possibility has come within view, that men, not here and there, but on a large scale, might attain to that hitherto hopeless thing to the multitude, goodness—is one of the most singular and solemn things in history.’

The sermon on the ‘Transformation of Pity’ displays to us the change which was made in the whole conception and practice of this virtue through the discovery opened up by Christ that pity is divine and is felt by God Himself. And here we may note that one of the most prominent features in Dr. Paget’s work is the excellent use which he is able to make of his stores of classical learning. We ever find the attainments of Greek and Roman morality set in the fairest light, yet without conceding to them the imagined superiority in gaiety and healthiness of tone which has been attributed, against the plainest history, to heathenism for the purpose of depreciating Christianity. In the ‘Records of the Past’ will be found some sober judgments upon the Reformation in the Church of England; and a mournful picture, only too authentic, of the state of religion in those early days of Queen Elizabeth which some look back on as the palmy time when well-deserved hatred of Rome was fresh and active. ‘The Force of Faith’ is a very admirable sermon, showing how wonderful are the effects of faith in oneself and one’s fellow-men, and then in necessary sequence how much greater will be the power of faith in God. We do not quite see why this excellent sermon should have been placed among those upon the difficulties of disbelief; it seems to us more appropriately to belong to the subject of the faculties of positive religion. And the same remark suggests itself regarding the concluding discourse of the volume, one of the best of the whole series, the deeply spiritual exposition of the nature of the Inner Life as tested by its love. We have to thank Dr. Paget for a volume which perhaps those who love sensational writing may find too reflective for their taste, but which we are sure none can read without acquiring a stronger conviction that in Christ Jesus every want of the soul is supplied.

Rational Aspects of some Revealed Truths. By EDWARD B. OTTLEY, M.A. (London: Rivingtons, 1887.)

THESE six essays ‘were delivered as addresses to a mixed congregation’ at St. Peter’s, Eaton Square, in the Holy Week of 1883. ‘They make no claim whatever to originality. They are meant to help persons of average intelligence, for whom most of the apologetic literature of the day is, in one or another sense, inaccessible. The writer has found by experience that some of the lines of argument suggested have brought comfort to earnest seekers after truth.’ (*Pref.*)

Note.) We think that they are well calculated to do so, and that this small volume will do good, although its style in parts appears to us too rhetorical, and although, on such a question as that of 'the sequence of the orders of life,' the discrepancy between the first chapter of Genesis and the actual conclusions of science appears to be understated (p. 68). Mr. Otley traces *popular* unbelief, in large measure, to social discontent, which, if fully developed, would mean Nihilism: in philosophical unbelief he discerns (and rightly, as far as we can judge) the imperious sway of a 'materialism which has no logical connexion with science, but co-operates with other tendencies to blind men's eyes to the claims of moral and spiritual truth,' which 'characterises our culture and our barbarism as well, has shown itself in shallow and one-sided philosophy, has drawn a film of sensuality over our æstheticism . . . has lowered the aims and the efforts of philanthropic reformers . . . has most disastrously affected our ethical standards,' &c. He might well, we think, have encouraged his readers to hope that the very magnitude of the evil would to a great extent work its own cure. The fact that, in Dr. Flint's words, 'when materialism comes to deal with mind it simply breaks down,' that it cannot explain personal 'self-consciousness,' and that it 'is irreconcilable with the moral feelings of human nature,' or, as the Duke of Argyll has expressed it, that 'there are two great enemies to materialism, one rooted in the affections, the other in the intellect,' is a sufficient proof that, even if the present Bishop of Manchester was over-sanguine when he said last year that its 'knell had been rung in Europe,' it cannot ultimately dominate the mind of a being who feels himself to be a person and a moral agent. It is, after all, in this indestructible sense of the spiritual element in human nature—of that which, in the fullest sense, makes man to be what he is—that religious faith will find its recuperative power. Nor is it paradoxical to say that positive atheism is at once a more respectable and more hopeful condition of mind than the flabby 'agnosticism' which disguises from itself the true character of its own standing-ground. One who has made up his mind that there is no God is more likely, by virtue of his seriousness and his coherence of thought, to work himself right some day on the question of all questions, than one who contents himself with saying, 'I don't know, and you don't know, and it does not matter.' The atheist who retains a respect for his own humanity may come to see that its true interest and dignity are involved in the existence and the sovereignty of God; and in proportion as he cares for morality, he may come to feel that the abnegation of God is, as Dr. Arnold said long ago, too great a 'moral sacrifice' for any man who really loves goodness. But we may seem to be forgetting Mr. Otley. The larger part of his volume is taken up with the enforcement of the position, that genuine Christianity is based on the Divine Incarnation. Here, as is natural, he follows the argument of Dr. Liddon's famous lectures, including the consideration from our Lord's emphatic self-assertion and His manifest consciousness of a sinless sanctity. It is interesting to remember that the American revivalist, Mr. Moody, so well known to thousands in

Engla
theolog
not kno
or what
Divine,
for He
who sa
He ha
'Christ
without
'Christ
fourth
not the
(pp. 13
gelists'
actions
to man
tact wi
Christ
force a
clearly
practic
to the
of the
from C
which
neglect
dilutio
order
Mr. O
apart f
bereft
ralism
whethe
aim a
physic
the de
sense n
any liv
living

Sermo
I
I

This
power
Sermo
in a y
beauti
liable

England, is here of one mind with the most accomplished of Anglican theologians and the most impressive of Anglican preachers. 'I did not know,' he says in a volume of *Addresses*, 'where to place Christ, or what to do with Him, if He were not Divine. . . . If He were not Divine, for that very reason He ought not to be called a good man, for He laid claim to an honour and dignity which those very people who say that He was merely the best man that ever lived declare He had no right to.' Mr. Ottley quotes the trenchant formula, 'Christus, aut Deus aut non bonus,' as if from St. Augustine, but without giving any reference. In a somewhat different wording—'Christus si non Deus, non bonus'—it forms a page heading in the fourth of Dr. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures* (ed. xi. p. 206), but it is not there ascribed to the 'Doctor of Grace.' Mr. Ottley draws out (pp. 137–163) the evidence for our Lord's Deity from (1) the Evangelists' description of His 'Person and work, His character and His actions ;' (2) His own 'representations of His relations to God and to mankind ;' (3) the 'convictions' of those 'who were in close contact with Christ,' including him who could ask, 'Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?' He adds that 'the Christianity of history—of force and of fact—has been simply the worship of a Divine Christ,' clearly using 'worship' in a large sense, as involving the activities of a practical and loyal self-devotion. We have only space to allude further to the suggestive pages in the last address, in which Mr. Ottley treats of the attempt to de-spiritualise Christian morality, and detach it from Christian doctrine ; and also of that yet more pitiable enterprise which would present artistic culture as a sort of religion, a worship neglected by Christianity. Churchmen who are disposed to accept dilutions of, or substitutes for, the historic religion of Christendom, in order to win over the 'alienated,' may gain some useful hints from Mr. Ottley. He will set them thinking whether fruits can be had apart from their proper roots ; whether an eviscerated Christianity, bereft of what, for want of a better term, we may call its supernaturalism, will not be seen through and despised by hostile philosophy ; whether much of the current 'philanthropy,' avowedly secular in its aim and scope, is not animated by an excessive regard for mere physical gain or 'social advancement ;' whether art can really touch the deepest needs of human experience ; whether 'culture' in *that* sense may not be a superficial varnish ; whether, in short, there can be any living 'in the whole, the good, the beautiful,' otherwise than by living 'in the Lord.'

Sermons on Subjects from the New Testament. By J. R. WOODFORD, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Ely. Edited by H. M. LUCKOCK, D.D. (London : Rivingtons, 1887.)

THIS volume exhibits those characteristics of Bishop Woodford's power as a preacher which we lately noticed in its predecessor, the *Sermons on Old Testament Subjects*. But it exhibits them, we think, in a yet more perfect form : it is, on the whole, a richer book, more beautiful, more eloquent, more suggestive. The Bishop's style was liable to occasional excess of amplification ; but here we find an

unusual frequency of terse sayings which condense much into few words. 'Truth embodied in outward institutions lives. . . Christ embedded, as it were, the main points of His religion in external ordinances' (pp. 6, 8); 'The world likes a *little* religion' (p. 38); 'Religious instruction, when not honestly carried out, becomes itself a snare' (p. 39); 'The tremendous peril of playing with spiritual convictions' (p. 41); 'Wherever there is no belief in the Son of God, there is little belief in the Personality of God' (p. 110); 'The Incarnation is the great breakwater against Atheism' (p. 150);—which last two statements may summarize the argument in Dr. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures* as to the extent to which 'Theistic truth is protected by the doctrine of Christ's Divinity.' We have fresh evidence of Bishop Woodford's care to set forth truth in all its aspects. The Incarnation is emphasized on its Divine side, but also repeatedly on its human, as involving the permanence of our Lord's complete humanity (pp. 104, 141, 192, 205); and it is even suggested that the slow progress of His cause amid hindrances may mean that His mediatorial kingship, as Son of Man, has to work under conditions of human instrumentality (p. 108). The Church is presented as no mere 'association of men agreeing in certain opinions and combining together' (p. 10), not 'a mere congregation of men to which we may belong or not as we like' (p. 50), but 'Christ's own kingdom, a community having certain fixed laws of order and rules of living' (for 'Christianity from the very beginning manifested itself a thing of order, rule, system' (p. 207), 'a principle of continuity by a ministerial succession,' and as founded and endowed with 'His own Presence, for the purpose of maintaining certain truths and dispensing certain heavenly gifts' (p. 10). Yet, withal, the individual's responsibility is set forth as having been first fully brought out by the Gospel (p. 162), and Christ's discriminating love is described as contemplating and providing for the most intimate needs of every single Christian soul (p. 172). By the effectiveness of 'even the shadow of Peter' we are reminded of Divine love 'overflowing the prescribed' sacramental 'channels' of its operation (p. 88). Various points of Christian truth or duty are set in fresh light; we do not remember, for instance, to have elsewhere seen Acts ii. 11, as preceding Peter's discourse, employed to suggest that 'hearty worship of God' must, in the due order of things, precede 'hearty work for others' (p. 76). This vividness, this sense of reality, are features of the volume. Bishop Woodford, we feel, had his eye on the actual phenomena of modern Christian life. He speaks plainly of the vagueness and thinness of much that passes for belief. He knows how many, consciously or unconsciously, are paring down their creed, putting Christian motives for moral conduct into the background, trying to conciliate the outsiders who have no taste for religion by making Christianity as little of a religion as may be. Nothing easier than to 'follow the leading of Christ' when it prescribes uprightness, benevolence, or other social virtues; the test comes 'when He would lead' men 'further, to the acceptance of truths which cannot be demonstrated,' in the strict sense of that term.

'T
of Chris
of ange
lution
mornin
about t
of unb
Christi
their P
not trou
or not.
religion
minds
ing to t

We ma
teachin
'inflict
opport
sequen
assembl
a notic
We do
2-4, w
mantle
surely
has gi
Bishop
the A
Christ
so ma
timor
unnatu
'Ther
to God
ments
'the re
mercy
man's

The C.

THIS
Histor
manua
to the
Mr. C
implan
kingdo
and th
were c
domin

'The whole sacramental system, the new birth in baptism, the Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, the communion of saints, the ministration of angels, the gift of the Spirit in confirmation, the real force of the absolution pronounced, as it is affirmed, with power and authority every morning and evening in our holy places—how many are utterly indifferent about them! Besides those to whom these doctrines are simple matters of unbelief, there is a large body of well-informed, well-intentioned Christian men, who have heard of these things, who see them written in their Prayer-books, and who yet cast them from their minds. They do not trouble themselves to ascertain whether they have Scripture warrant or not. . . . There are, it will be urged by such, certain plain verities in religion which are enough for them; other points may suitably occupy the minds of the clergy; they, as practical men, feel exonerated from attending to them,' &c. (P. 179.)

We may mention two other points on which Bishop Woodford's teaching is specially opportune. One is that hell is not simple 'infliction of torment' by God on the lost, but is 'the ceasing of all opportunity of amendment and recovery' in the way of 'natural consequence' (p. 18); the other is that the saved will be 'no meagre assembly, no scanty few rescued from an almost universal ruin; such a notion irremediably derogates from the Redeemer's work' (p. 178). We do not quite follow the Bishop in his interpretation of 2 Cor. v. 2-4, where he says that 'the resurrection-body is represented as a mantle of glory put on over the present raiment of corruption;' it is surely rather to be 'put on over' the disembodied spirit. Though he has given some attractiveness to that sense of 2 Tim. i. 12 which Bishop Ellicott prefers in his commentary, and according to which the Apostle, at the close of his ministry, 'solemnly commends to Christ Jesus upon His throne the guardianship of the faith which for so many years he had been preaching,' and thereby excludes all timorous solicitude as to its fortunes (p. 129), we cannot but think it unnatural and confused. At p. 136 there is an error of the press—'There is no more difficult subject of thought than *our* relationship to God . . . of the thousands in our great towns and distant settlements who stand wholly aloof from religion.' Clearly we should read '*the* relationship.' The Bishop reminds us that Christ's 'wisdom and mercy may have a wide field for action in regard to those of whom man's ministry has no account to give.'

The Church and the Roman Empire. By the Rev. ARTHUR CARR, M.A. (London: Longmans, 1887.)

THIS volume, forming part of the series entitled *Epochs of Church History*, under the editorship of Professor Creighton, is a useful manual on 'the external growth of the Church,' and on its relations to the Imperial government 'during the fourth and fifth centuries.' Mr. Carr begins by striking the true note: 'The first leading idea implanted by Christ in the minds of His followers was the idea of a kingdom.' This suggested at once a comparison between the Church and the Empire; even when earthly conceptions of Christ's kingdom were cleared away, there remained the indisputable fact of a claim to dominate human life, to exercise a supreme jurisdiction over con-

science, to supersede all existing secular authorities when they came into collision with the transcendent rights of an unseen Lord. As Archbishop Trench has well expressed it (*Huls. Lect. p. 273*):—

‘The practical Roman saw at a glance that the question at issue between Christ and the world was not a question of one notion and another, but of one kingdom and another, and therefore he came at once to the point, “Art thou a king, then?” And that empire which tolerated all other religions would have tolerated the Christian, but that it instinctively felt that this, however its first seat and home might seem to be in the hearts of men, yet could not remain there, but would demand an outward expression for itself, must go forth into the world and conquer a dominion of its own.’

Hence the Roman persecutions: or, as Mr. Carr puts it, ‘in this way Cæsarism and Christianity clashed.’ And surely we may add that the concentrated energy and determination of the Church in that great conflict form a difficulty in the way of that disintegrating hypothesis which regards her organization as a thing, so to speak, accidental, external to her real life, and not traceable to any Divine appointment. Mr Carr occupies throughout the standpoint of a Churchman. He thus does homage to the greatest name in this period:—

‘Undoubtedly no figure in ecclesiastical history stands out with more impressive grandeur . . . than that of Athanasius; no one has rendered higher or more difficult and varied service to the cause of truth and of Christ. Other leaders in a great crisis may have been more learned, more powerful in speech and argument, of quicker intuition, of deeper contemplation; but no one, since St. Paul, had singly filled a wider space in contemporary Church history; no one had risen nearer to the apostolic ideal in zeal for Christ, in activity of service, and in courageous defence of the faith as delivered to the saints.’ (P. 55.)

With regard to ‘intuition,’ we have always considered that it was one of the special gifts of Athanasius to see into the heart of a question, to distinguish what was verbal from what was essential, and to do justice to diverse aspects of the truth. Of St. Ambrose Mr. Carr says (somewhat too stringently) that his principles

‘on the relations of Church and State would, if actually put in force, destroy the just balance between civil and ecclesiastical government. But’ (it is added) ‘the practical assertion of the supreme authority of . . . moral right in the government of the world, and the limitation thereby imposed on the imperial rule, gives a supreme importance to his episcopate.’ (P. 101.)

We may also refer to the estimate taken (p. 130) of St. Augustine’s *De Civitate Dei*:—

‘It is at once a review of history and an exposition of the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church. There are few things finer in literature than the comprehensive sweep of St. Augustine’s intellect in his criticism of the events and politics of the pagan past, of all philosophy, and of all aspects of life, in his *City of God*. Nothing can be gentler or more generous than his attitude towards mistaken beliefs. Nothing can exceed his readiness to recognize what is beautiful and noble in character or in nationality, or his eagerness to claim it for Christianity.’

So, again
‘a beginn
it has alw
‘we are c
not been
selfishnes
unpurged

This disa
successes
in the fac
the facts
mind of
softening
well as g
had clash
secularizi
especially
the sons
paganism
who is po
which ha
and ther
were inst
poet cou
Honorius
in danger
by a *priv*

There
be corre
Sardica i
is Decen
before E
a ‘decla
tine’s ar
full ‘ass
—*intra*
reference
in his c
pamphle
as to Al
comes in
account
told who

Acta Po
Jah
von
Kol

THE ma
volume c

So, again, the effect of St. Chrysostom's preaching is described as

'a beginning of that Christian influence on vast urban populations which it has always been the just ambition of the Church to secure;' but yet 'we are compelled to see darker lines in the picture. Christianity has not been able, as enthusiasts might have hoped, to sweep away the selfishness, the lust, the cruelty of the pagan world. Society was still unpurged; every page of Chrysostom's homilies teaches this.' (P. 139.)

This disappointment of a sanguine idealism, this limitation of the successes of the Divine kingdom, this tenacious 'vitality' of paganism in the face of Christianity, itself enthroned and imperialized, is one of the facts which Mr. Carr brings home with special vividness to the mind of a reader. Under Constantine, Christianity succeeded in softening the hardness of pagan legislation; and yet 'it had lost as well as gained by the revolution, and the change of imperial favour had clashed with many interests.' Christian life was exposed to secularizing influences; paganism was biding its time, and 'in Rome especially it continued to prosper;' penal measures against it, under the sons of Constantine, procured for 'thoughtful and philosophic paganism' the credit of unworldly disinterestedness; the unhappy prince who is popularly entitled the Apostate 'had been forced into a service which had been misrepresented to him, and which he found irksome,' and therefore 'never gave his heart to Christ;' heathen scholars were instructors of a future ecclesiastical historian; a brilliant Roman poet could pointedly ignore Christianity; a pagan commander under Honorius 'displayed the qualities which a prosperous Christianity was in danger of losing,—he refused to be restored to his rank in the army by a *privilegium*' (p. 160).

There are a few oversights in this attractive book which can be corrected in a second edition. The date of the Council of Sardica is now known to be 343, not 347; that of George's murder is December 361; Ulfilas is proved, by the evidence recently laid before English readers in Mr. Charles Scott's volume, to have been a 'declared' Arian from the beginning of his ministry; Constantine's argument for Arianism at Milan was delivered, not in the full 'assemblage,' but behind the curtain of the presence-chamber, —*intra velum*, as Lucifer tells us (*Moriendum*, 1.); and Lucifer's references to Old Testament history appear to have been made, not in his oral reply to the Emperor, but in one of his vehement pamphlets (*De non parcendo*, &c.). The charge against Athanasius as to Alexandrian corn-ships is mentioned too early in p. 45, but comes in its right place in p. 46; and the reader who meets with an account of Galla Placidia's Church work at Ravenna in p. 153 is not told who she was until he comes to p. 167.

Acta Pontificum Romanorum inedita; Urkunden der Päpste vom Jahre 590 bis zum Jahre 1197, gesammelt und herausgegeben von Dr. P. v. Pflugk-Harttung. Band III. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1886.)

THE majority of the *Acta* in the present, as in each preceding, volume of Dr. Pflugk-Harttung's magnificent undertaking belong to

Italy and to the twelfth century. The reason will be apparent to those who have read his *Iter Italicum*. During the last few years the State archives of the Italian cities have been brought into better order, and most of the Italian caputular libraries have been opened more freely to scholars. The editor was commissioned by the Berlin Academy of Sciences to explore and report upon the hitherto unused documentary treasures of the cities, cathedrals, and monasteries of Italy. An alphabetical list of the Italian archives and libraries, with the names of their librarians, and a general account of the documentary treasures in each, will be found in the work which we have mentioned. Dr. Pflugk-Hartung was astonished at the enormous mass of papal documents still lying unused in them. He came upon numbers which had escaped the persistent scrutiny of Jaffé; and during the progress of this work he has printed several of which Jaffé has only recorded the place and the subject. During the twelfth century three powers were contending for secular supremacy in Italy: (1) The Emperor, who was still technically regarded as a sort of temporal head of Western Europe, and who took his chief title from Rome; (2) the Republican cities—amongst which Rome itself was included, under the short-lived triumph of Arnold of Brescia; and (3) the Roman Pontiff. The Republican cities, while contending for local liberty and self-government, conceded a certain degree of sovereignty to the distant Cæsar across the Alps, as the divinely appointed 'Caput mundi,' and as the secular 'Caput totius Latinitatis;' while neither the Cæsar nor the Republics questioned for an instant the spiritual supremacy of the Popes. Nothing contributed more to the self-aggrandisement of the papacy than the way in which the Emperor and the Italian Republican cities tried to subsidise the spiritual power against one another. Hence it is that the Popes of the twelfth century, at least in Italy, appear at one time as Imperialists, and at another almost as Republicans. The Emperors had indeed a dangerous weapon in their power of indirectly creating a Pope of their own, by the votes of their party among the Roman cardinals; and it must often have been a hard problem for the individual Christian conscience in the English and other National Churches, which had no interest in the Italian territorial squabbles, to know who was rightly the Pope and who the anti-Pope. The ultimate decision, at all events for the National Churches, was almost always purely Erastian. The rival Popes appealed to the kings, rather than to the bishops of England and France, to decide which of the two was the undoubted successor of S. Peter. The great contest whether Rome itself was to be imperial, republican, or papal, was virtually decided during the stirring pontificate of the only Englishman who was ever Bishop of Rome. The documents of Hadrian IV. in this volume are numerous, though there is not one amongst them which has any direct interest for the Church of his native land. They all concern local Italian monasteries and churches, and consist mostly of 'faculties' taking a monastery 'under the protection of S. Peter and the Roman bishop,' and 'confirming' it 'in the enjoyment of its possessions and privileges.' These documents richly

illustrate
episcopal
into the
authority
synod, v
monaste
or prior
equally
body of
bishop w
to depre
these pa
tences th
or prior
and the
'the ang
Paul, up
presume

Near
documen
was of fa
his Eng
the Con
though
foreign C
'repress
Italian r
Pompos
Genoa
episcopo
nec in
grants to
ring, san
dulgenti
'popery
in Venic
are priv
reward f
Church
in Napl
those wh
them wi
Bartolon
Church
become

The
the cont
illustrati
Alexand
Anagni,

illustrate the steady policy of the papacy to depress the Italian episcopate, and to reduce the 'venerabilis frater,' the local bishop, into the mere lieutenant of the Pope. Exemption from episcopal authority, and from the obligation of appearing at the bishop's synod, was a petition incessantly applied for by the heads of the monasteries, and always readily granted. Concessions to an abbot or prior to wear the mitre or ring and bear the pastoral staff are equally numerous. This symbolical elevation of the president of a body of monks or collegiate canons to an equality with the diocesan bishop was also a part of the traditional policy of the Roman bishops to depress and humiliate their Italian brother bishops. In all cases these papal grants of the twelfth century state in their opening sentences that the quasi-episcopal dignity is conferred upon the abbot or prior as an acknowledgment of his singular devotion to S. Peter and the Roman Chair, and they close as invariably with a threat of 'the anger of Almighty God, and of His blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, upon any persons soever, ecclesiastical or secular, who shall presume to violate this apostolical constitution.'

Nearly a fourth of the volume is occupied by hitherto unedited documents of Hadrian's successor, Alexander III., whose pontificate was of far greater importance to the Church of England than that of his English predecessor. He was the canoniser of King Edward the Confessor, and the patron of S. Thomas of Canterbury. Although Alexander eagerly supported the archbishops and bishops of foreign Churches against emperors and kings, he was himself a great 'repressor' of the Italian episcopate. In his grants of exemption to Italian monasteries, as to the abbot and monks of Santa Maria della Pomposa (1160), and to the abbot and monks of San Fruttuoso in Genoa (1162), we find the words 'Decernimus, ut nulli archiepiscopo, nulli episcopo liceat monasterio vestro gravamen inferre, nec in ipso aut ejus rebus potestatem exercere.' The frequent grants to Italian abbots of the right of wearing the episcopal mitre, ring, sandals, are described in different letters as a 'facultas,' an 'indulgentia,' a 'beneficium.' They were always rewards for the 'popery' of the receiver. Thus Vivianus, the prior of San Salvatore in Venice, is informed by Alexander III. that he and his successors are privileged 'by apostolical authority' to wear the mitre as 'a reward for devotion and constancy of faith toward the holy Roman Church and our person;' while Roger, the abbot of San Severino in Naples, is told that 'the Apostolic See knows how to reward those who are devout and faithful toward it, and loves to decorate them with some ecclesiastical honour;' and Walter, abbot of San Bartolomeo in Carpineto, is told that 'it is the custom of the Roman Church to decorate those prelates who honour her, that they may become even more devoted to her.'

The relations of Alexander III. to the Church of England during the contest between the King and the Archbishop do not find much illustration in the present volume. There are only six letters of Alexander III. to England in the collection. The first, dated from Anagni, February 7, 1161, is to the Abbot Laurence and the Chapter

of Westminster, stating that he has granted their petition and the petition of 'our most dear son,' Henry (II.), 'the illustrious King of the English,' by canonising and inscribing in the Catalogue of the Saints, Edward, the late glorious King of the English.' His rival, Victor IV., was acknowledged as Pope by the Emperor and the German bishops, and Alexander was anxious to get the support of the King of England to his own claims. The other letters of Alexander III. are all concerned with the interests of a certain 'Magister David.' First, Alexander wrote in 1171 to the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln informing them that as the Church of Lincoln was without a bishop [it was vacant from 1168 to 1173] he himself, 'acting in the plenitude of the power conferred on him by the Lord, and by the authority of blessed Peter,' by this faculty instituted Master David a canon of their Church, and conceded to him the first vacant prebend: 'Instituimus et concedimus,' he says, 'statuentes, ut si episcopus, vel alius quislibet contra hoc venire presumpserit, ejus in hac parte factum nullas vires optineat.' This was a papal blow at episcopal liberty and jurisdiction in the Church of England. The Dean and Chapter of Lincoln, however, appear to have been very slow in obeying the 'apostolical' command, for Pflugk-Hartung prints a second letter to them, in which the Pope repeats his command. 'It specially pertains to our office,' he tells them, 'to assign to honest and learned men fit places in the Church of God.' Hence he 'provides' Master David with a canonry in their Church, declaring the said David to be worthy 'non solum canonicatui sed episcopali etiam dignitati.' For this reason, he says, 'we constitute him by apostolical authority a canon of your Church, and by the same power we assign to him the first prebend which shall fall vacant.' The Pope adds that the Dean and Chapter are 'to be greatly congratulated upon the fellowship of such a man.' He next informs them that 'if any bishop, or other person, shall presume or attempt to assign the next vacant prebend to anyone else,' the act will have no force, but will be 'irritum et vacuum,' and that, until a prebend becomes vacant, the Chapter must find for Master David 'aliquod beneficium annuum, pro beati Petri et nostra reverentia.' The aggressions of this Pope upon the domestic rights and liberties of the local Churches in England on behalf of this 'Magister David' do not seem to have ended at Lincoln. There is a letter from Alexander III. to the Dean and Chapter of S. Paul's, London, scolding them for their behaviour to 'their fellow-canon Magister David,' in keeping back part of his dues, and the Pope orders the Dean to pay him all arrears. It is probable that the Dean of S. Paul's was as slow as the Dean of Lincoln in complying with the 'apostolical injunction,' for the next following letter is addressed to Gilbert (Foliot), Bishop of London—Becket's adversary, whom the Primate had shortly before excommunicated—saying that 'Master Gilbert, canon of thy Church, has been faithful concerning thy business, in secret and in public,' and warning the bishop against giving credit 'adversus eum pravis aliquorum suggestionibus,' but to see that he is duly remunerated. There is a letter of the same date

(Apri
that A
been
curia.
is a lo
the E
order
ralibu
to de
they f
by 't
with n

Chry

THIS
bridg
has b
prize
tunate
and a
for bo

T
may l
It das
consi
from
'in to
sneer
disco
We c
positi
the se
hand
soston
philos
value
while

In
of int
basis
well-t
the el
an ex
'myst
one w
the t
Bible
insigh

(April, 1171) to King Henry II., in which the Pope tells the King that Archdeacon Reginald of Salisbury and 'Magister David' have been zealous in their representation of his business at the Roman curia. The only other document concerning the Church of England is a letter from the same Pope (undated, but about 1170-1172) to the English bishops Bartholomew of Exeter and Roger of Worcester, ordering them to inquire into the causes of the decay 'in temporalibus et spiritualibus' of S. Augustine's at Canterbury. They are to demand from the monks the 'nudam et simplicem veritatem.' If they find the monks past reformation, the two bishops are empowered, by 'this apostolical letter,' to turn them all out, and to fill their places with monks of the same order from other monasteries.

Chrysostom: a Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation. By FREDERIC HENRY CHASE, M.A. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1887.)

THIS monograph is an essay which gained a University prize at Cambridge, and which has been published after three years' further labour has been spent upon it. Certainly no one will think that either the prize was undeserved or the labour ill bestowed. We have unfortunately to read many books which are equally destitute of learning and ability; we have hailed with delight one which is conspicuous for both.

There are two ways in which Chrysostom's work as an exegete may be treated. The one is that adopted by Archdeacon Farrar. It dashes him off in a couple of pages, and of this space devotes a considerable portion to his general life. It contains the quotation from Dante which is indispensable for everyone who wishes to be 'in touch' with the times. There is also the equally indispensable sneer at dogmatism and sacerdotalism. The supposed subject of the discourse is alluded to incidentally in a few magniloquent periods. We can earnestly commend this course to anyone who aspires to the position of a sophist or popular preacher. Mr. Chase has chosen the second way. He prefers to write about the subject he has in hand; he has the self-denial not to insert a single period on Chrysostom against the court. He is learned, industrious, careful, and philosophical, and has thus succeeded in producing a work of real value, and one which may rival a German monograph in learning, while it is far superior in lucidity and clearness of arrangement.

In the first chapter he traces the growth of the Antiochene school of interpretation, and shows how reaction against Origenism was the basis of its sound common sense and freedom from allegorism. A well-trained Cambridge scholar can hardly be expected to bring out the element of truth there is in Newman's paradox of the danger of an excessive devotion to pure literalism. We may condemn the 'mysticism' of the early Fathers; but though a fault it is—yet it is one which arises from an excess of spiritual earnestness. Which is the truest, the criticism of a German specialist who considers the Bible an interesting subject for anatomical study, or the spiritual insight of a commentator whose whole life is filled with the Divine

teaching of the book, even if the latter has a mystical interpretation of the number of Abraham's household?

On the Old Testament Chrysostom had much of the difficulty which some modern theologians feel. How was he to defend or meet the attacks on its morality and teaching which certain heretics were so fond of making? He might have wandered off into Origenistic mazes of allegorism. As a matter of fact he adopted principles of interpretation which showed a decided approach to the most modern answers. The Bible owes its very existence to the condescension of God to man (*συγκατάβασις*), and hence revelation must be conditioned by the instruments through which it came. God, to make His meaning clear to man, uses the language of man. When anthropomorphic expressions occur they are used relatively and not absolutely. 'Do not interpret the expression in a merely human sense, but account the grossness of the phrase as due to human weakness.' And similarly with moral ideas, he partially recognizes what would be modern explanations. The law of revenge was necessary for a primitive state of society. 'The lawgiver who lays down no law of vengeance against evildoers simply equips them with the armour of impunity, and is as one who puts swords into their hands.' And the law was made as lofty in its philanthropy as the times allowed. It is of the utmost importance in the present day to recognize that on such subjects as the moral ideas of the Old Testament thoughtful men among early Christians had the same difficulties as we have, and opponents of the faith brought the same objections. It is equally important both for estimating the exegetical value of the Fathers, and also to corroborate our own convictions, to realize that they too understood the progressiveness of the Scriptural revelation and the gradual education of the world. Of course in many of his interpretations Chrysostom does not completely carry out this idea. Sometimes he drifts into allegorism, sometimes he shows the blunted moral vision which had influenced his conduct in his early life. We do not wish to deny his faults; we only ask that his merits too may be recognized.

We must pass over much that is interesting. In the chapter on Criticism and Scholarship Mr. Chase collects evidence to show that in Chrysostom's day the Syrian text had been settled by an authoritative revision. Passing to the New Testament, we find that it is as an interpreter of St. Paul's Epistles that Chrysostom is at his best. Here he has the 'enthusiasm of sympathy.' 'I do not understand the Apostle by reason of any intellectual ability or acuteness of my own, but because I keep continually in his company and love him much.' But this is not his only, though his greatest merit. He recognizes the importance of understanding the position of the writer and recipient of the epistle; he recognizes the importance of interpreting a passage by its context. 'Paul himself interprets his meaning in the words which follow.' We must go further than this. 'We must not examine the words as bare words, else many absurdities will follow, nor must we investigate the language by itself, *but we must mark the mind of the writer.*'

We
Fathers
or no l
wrong.
answer
Chrysos
seize at
terpret
is the c
the full
plation
outweig
results
scientific
genius—
We
pretatio
as far a
We mu
minute
recomm
writes.

The A
M.
(L

We are
Sadler.
makes
that is
be sour
Apostle
reputat
correct

'Th
work.
says, "
plished.
work af
on earth
After th
Acts, w
Jesus g
traitor.
through
He had
Him to
him. I
the Bo
His Spi
may be

VOL

We are sometimes asked, Why is it you lay such stress on the Fathers as interpreters of Scripture? You allow that they knew little or no Hebrew; you allow that very often they are demonstrably wrong. What, then, are their merits? To those who know them no answer is required; for those who do not a very short one will suffice. Chrysostom may have many faults, but his genius enabled him to seize at once the mind of St. Paul, and he, as no one else, can interpret the epistles from the point of view of their writer. Augustine is the one writer whose theological intuition enabled him to grasp the full meaning of faith. Origen lived in regions of Divine contemplation to which few can approach. These are merits which will outweigh many defects. The merits of modern criticism are the results of industry, of cultivated leisure, and of the growth of a scientific spirit; the merits of a Chrysostom or Augustine come from genius—almost from inspiration.

We have said enough, we hope, on the merits of patristic interpretation, of Augustine, and of Mr. Chase. We can only add that, as far as we know, Mr. Chase's book is remarkably free from errors. We must honestly confess that his learning is often too varied and minute for us to be able to speak authoritatively. We can thoroughly recommend the book, and hope it will not be the last that Mr. Chase writes.

The Acts of the Apostles, with Notes Critical and Practical. By M. F. Sadler, Rector of Honiton and Prebendary of Wells. (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1887.)

WE are always glad to welcome a new book from the pen of Mr. Sadler. There is a vigour and freshness about his writings which makes it a pleasure to read them, while there is certain to be much that is instructive, and their tone and tendency are equally certain to be sound and edifying. This short Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles is no exception to the rule, and it well supports the established reputation of its author. The spirit in which it is written may be correctly gathered from a note on one of the opening verses:—

‘The work of Jesus while on earth was but the beginning of His work. It was a work done under difficulties. “I have a Baptism,” He says, “to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished.” The work before the Ascension was but the beginning. The work after the Ascension was the continuance and the application. While on earth He worked on a few, and under the restraints of a human sphere. After the Ascension He worked on the world from a Divine sphere. The Acts, while they are the Acts of human instruments, are yet the Acts of Jesus glorified. He chooses the apostle who is to fill the place of the traitor. He baptizes with the Holy Ghost at Pentecost (ii.33). His Name, through faith in His Name, makes the lame man strong. God, though He had raised up Jesus out of the sight of men, had none the less sent Him to bless them. The Lord personally appears to Saul and converts him. Peter says to Dorcas “Jesus Christ maketh thee whole.” So that the Book of the Acts is the account of the Risen Lord working through His Spirit by the hands of His servants; and yet with all this the Acts may be called the Gospel of the Holy Ghost; for in it the Holy Spirit is

VOL. XXV.—NO. XLIX.

Q

in the forefront, personally present, baptizing, teaching, directing, restraining, forbidding—all but personally appearing' (p. 2).

These words may be taken as the key-note of the volume. They tell of the power to which everything is referred, the point of view from which everything is regarded. The Acts are not a mere human history, a correct account of what was done by our Lord's Apostles after He left the world; they are much more than this. They contain a revelation from on high just as the Gospels do, and therefore we need not say there is no toning down of miraculous agency, or attempts to explain it away. The tendency is all the other way, to make the most of what is said about supernatural power and unseen influences. Thus, in speaking of the sin of Ananias and Sapphira, Mr. Sadler says it 'was hypocrisy and a tempting of the Spirit akin to blasphemy against Him. The excess of its guilt depended on the clear manifestation of the Spirit as acting in the Apostles, and so it seems to me it ought never to be used as a warning against common lying.' 'All bodies of Christians put those who adhere to them in great danger of this sin who encourage a profession of spirituality in prayer meetings, or meetings for the exhibition of what is called Christian experience. Those who take part in such things would be scarcely human if they did not bring forward what they consider to be the best state of things within them, and "keep back" that which would be to their spiritual or even moral discredit.' Then in commenting upon xvii. 26, 'And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation,' he insists upon the fullest and most literal interpretation of the latter clause of the sentence. He contends that by these words we are taught that God had not only preordained the place upon the earth of each race of men, but also 'those epochs in the history of each which were beyond man's control, but which contributed to make them what they were, such as the appearance of certain teachers among them, their conquest of other nations, or their being conquered by others.' Writing from the point of view named above, he shrinks from admitting the inaccuracies which are sometimes charged against portions of the Acts, notably the speech of St. Stephen before the Council. Thus, when the protomartyr says 'I will carry you away beyond Babylon,' Mr. Sadler reminds us that

'the Hebrew and Septuagint both read "beyond Damascus." This may be an inaccuracy in the original defence of Stephen. In which case, as I have said more than once, his inspiration was only for spiritual purposes, to give the spiritual application of the Old Testament, and not to preserve him from mere slips of memory. It may, however, have been an intentional correction of the statement of the prophet; for the Israelites were carried away beyond both Damascus and Babylon, when, as related in 2 Kings xvii. 6, they were placed in the cities of the Medes, so that the vengeance executed upon them was beyond that foretold.' (P. 132.)

To turn to another and different side of the principle on which this Commentary is written. In speaking of St. Paul taking the Nazarite vow upon him, he writes:—

'T
have vo
utmost
religion
it must
was a
he rega
And yet
rather p
he desir
of religio
said tha
had not
But suc
perform
to God,
took this
of expre
above h
could in
the Naz
direction
ordered
salem.'

On
noble th
daily, w
has some
a jealous
of the C
with the
modern
more lik
who de
judgmen
such exp
intelligen
correct
commen
of which
same as
relative
And he
made in
have bee
in it of
a public
in which
cised wo
he says:

'Such
treated it

'The fact that St. Paul should not merely have submitted, but should have voluntarily chosen to offer to God such a service as this, is of the utmost significance. It shows us how very different his religion (taking religion to be religious observance) was to what many of us suppose that it must have been. The general idea among ultra-Protestants is that he was a man so wholly taken up with preaching Christ crucified that he regarded all formal observances as being utterly beneath his notice. And yet, when we come to look into the facts of his life, we find that he rather preached Christ risen, and that, prompted by his own will, he desired to express his gratitude to God by what was as formal a piece of religious ritual as is to be found in the whole Bible. It has often been said that he did this to please the Jews, by showing them that Christianity had not absolutely alienated him from the Law in its ceremonial aspect. But such a view is to be energetically repudiated; for it makes him perform an act of religious devotion, not with the view of being acceptable to God, but of being pleasing to men. There can be no doubt that St. Paul took this view, and performed its (to us) strange obligations with the view of expressing his gratitude to God by something which was over and above his daily sacrifice of himself. . . . He already did as much as he could in that way. But there was another way open to him—the way of the Nazarite, a way frequently adopted by his countrymen under the direction of God's word; and he not only chose this, but apparently ordered his journeyings so that he might in due form fulfil it at Jerusalem.' (P. 348.)

On the oft-quoted passage of the people of Berea being more noble than those of Thessalonica because they searched the Scriptures daily, whether 'these things were' as stated by the Apostle, Mr. Sadler has some words of caution. He bids those who search the Scriptures in a jealous, self-asserting spirit remember that the Fathers and Doctors of the Church 'seem to have known the letter and been permeated with the spirit of the Scriptures as much as, or more, as a rule, than modern expositors,' and that these Fathers and Doctors were infinitely more likely to be right in their interpretations than any private person who depends wholly or chiefly upon his own unaided private judgment; and he also bids such persons remember that not only such expositors, but their own teachers, read Scripture as carefully and intelligently as they do, and are at least as likely to arrive at its correct interpretation. In opposition to the general consent of commentators, Mr. Sadler thinks that St. Paul's visit to Jerusalem, of which he speaks in the Epistle to the Galatians (ii. 1), was not the same as that in which the first Council at Jerusalem made a decree relative to circumcision, but that it took place some time previously. And he gives us his reasons for this view, that there is no mention made in the Galatians of the Council, which there presumably would have been if it had then taken place, and that Paul the Apostle speaks in it of privately consulting with Peter, James, and John, and not of a public conference. Then in an elaborate note upon circumcision, in which he points out that for one who was baptized to be circumcised would be a practical abandonment of what he had received, he says:—

'Such going back was the sign of real unbelief, and so the Apostle treated it as apostasy. The sign of the new covenant and the sign of the

old could not possibly exist together in the same system—for if the one was the sacrament of faith, the other was the sign of the opposite of true faith ruling in the soul, because he who received it by doing so declared his unbelief in the all-sufficing Christ.'

It would be easy to illustrate the principles on which this Commentary is written at greater length, but what we have said will show our readers what they may expect if they should purchase this volume, as we trust many of them will do. Mr. Sadler's remarks on evening communions in connexion with the restoration of Eutychus to life; the baptism of Apollos; the influence of St. James at the Council in Jerusalem; St. Paul's ordination,—are interesting, and in some cases original. At the end of the volume there are short essays on the later years of St. Paul; on the medical language of St. Luke, and on the gift of tongues; which are instructive, and will be found helpful to students of this part of Holy Scripture.

The Epistle to the Ephesians: its Doctrine and Ethics. By R. W. DALE, M.A., LL.D., Birmingham. Third edition. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1887.)

DR. DALE is well known as a theologian whose fame has travelled far beyond the limits of the sect to which he belongs. His lectures on the Atonement are largely used by theological students of very various opinions. Both his ability and his reputation demand a careful consideration from us of whatever he writes, and a careful examination of points in which we differ from him.

His lectures on the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, the third edition of which lies before us, are in many ways admirable. In the first place they are thoroughly theological in tone. They rise above 'the geography of the Holy Land, the crimes of the family of Herod, the laws of Roman municipalities, &c.,' which, as he complains, absorb such an undue amount of attention, and confer only subsidiary aid to apprehend the Christian revelation. Dr. Dale recognizes the necessity of theology as the root of the spiritual life.

'If at the present time the religious life of the Church is languid, and if in its enterprises there is little of audacity and of vehemence, a partial explanation is to be found in that decline of intellectual interest in the contents of the Christian Faith which has characterized the last hundred or hundred and fifty years of our history.' (P. 237.)

These lectures, therefore, assuming the necessary antiquarian and grammatical knowledge, are devoted to elucidating the theological and ethical teaching of the Epistle.

In the next place Dr. Dale has all the literary qualities necessary for the task he has undertaken. His style is lucid, vigorous, and often eloquent; his arrangement is clear, and he has, too, a wide knowledge of human nature. He has deep spiritual insight, and handles theological problems ably and reverently.

It is just because of these merits, which make Dr. Dale the foremost theologian of the sects, and which make his theology much more palatable to us than that of many who profess to be churchmen, that we feel bound to devote some space to the points on which we

differ
stand
the P
on th
are p
he sa
'Just
one c
been
permi

But
practi
the te
sians
sufferi
purific
minut
teachi
tion o
witness
assign
to dist
favour

We
In St.
over it
pende
presum
the Ap
really
positio
St. Pau
discipli
some n
meeting

But
Dr. Da
of Chri
union o
histori
accordi
organiz
polity a
church
whole p
a visit
and see
parties,
would a
of John

differ from him. And our readers will have no difficulty in understanding what they are. On the Person and work of the Redeemer the Protestant churches have inherited the teaching of the Church; on the doctrines of grace and election the errors of the Reformers are posts of warning to our author. Though we may not agree with all he says, we recognize with pleasure his appreciation of the fact that 'Justification by Faith' represents only one side of the truth against one class of unbelievers, and that 'that beautiful word Grace has been soiled by unclean hands, tainted by contact with corrupt and pernicious forms of religious thought' (p. 177).

But it is on the doctrine of the Church that both theoretically and practically Dr. Dale is divorced from the Christianity of history and the teaching of St. Paul. Few in reading the Epistle to the Ephesians can help feeling that the key-note to the Epistle is the Church suffering and stained with corrupt elements on earth, glorified and purified in heaven. It is this conception which links together the minute practical regulations and the lofty doctrinal and mystical teaching. That this lofty idea of the Church is a correct interpretation of the Epistle, and not a mere prejudice of our own, the best witness we can refer to is Pfleiderer (*Paulinism*, vol. ii. p. 162), who assigns so late a date to the Epistle that he does not find it necessary to distort its meaning, and who cannot be accused of prejudices in favour of sacerdotalism.

We will now examine Dr. Dale's views of the *Unity* of the Church. In St. Paul's time, he tells us, 'every separate church had authority over its own affairs. . . . There was no confederation of these independent societies under any central ecclesiastical authority.' We presume that Dr. Dale assigns some historical value to the Acts of the Apostles, and also to the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and we really find it difficult to understand how he can avoid seeing in the position of the Apostles some central authority, and in the relation of St. Paul to the churches he had founded decidedly strict ecclesiastical discipline. When the Apostles had died, need was soon found of some new mode of expressing and preserving external unity, so meetings of bishops and synods speedily became common.

But we soon find that external unity of any kind is looked at by Dr. Dale as quite unnecessary. He considers the present divisions of Christendom by no means deplorable, and does not seem to desire union on any basis. But not only is this his own opinion; he is unhistorical enough to ascribe it to St. Paul. 'The unity of the Church, according to Paul's conception of it, is a unity of life, not of external organization. It actually exists, notwithstanding differences of polity and differences of creed. Christian men belong to different churches, but "the body" of Christ is "one," &c.' (p. 290). The whole paragraph teems with fallacies. Just imagine for one moment a visit of St. Paul to this country. If he were to come to any town and see many churches all bearing the names of many different parties, he would naturally make inquiries. One person in answer would assert, I am of Peter, I am a Roman Catholic; another, I am of John Wesley; another, I am of Christ; I am a Christian who objects

to any other designation, and so on. And imagine then the indignant remonstrance which would break out from the Apostle's lips, 'Is Christ divided?' The dissensions of the churches, the beautiful variety of their creeds, the divisions and the schisms of the present day, the democratic prevalence of individual self-assertion, may be a lofty ideal, but it would certainly have been as distasteful to St. Paul as the variegated field of contemporary politics was to Plato.

It is not merely on theoretical grounds that we lament Dr. Dale's disregard of external unity. It is because we see constantly how the spread of Christianity is hampered by its divisions, that they weaken it in the eyes of infidelity, that they seriously hinder missionary work in places like India, that though we may be thankful there is, as he points out, considerable unity of doctrine among 'the immense majority of those who have called themselves Christians,' and though they have to a large extent a 'common ideal of ethical perfection,' yet this spiritual unity is obscured, and its action in the world hindered, by the absence of that unity of the Church which was guaranteed to St. Paul by 'one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all.'

We have said enough to show both our admiration of much of Dr. Dale's work, and our dissent from him on his interpretation of what is practically the key to the Epistle. In the absence of a good modern work of this character on the Epistle, we can recommend these lectures, together with the chapter of Pfleiderer to which we have referred. They will correct one another.

The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. The Epistle to the Ephesians, with Introduction and Notes. By the Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1886.)

THE second book before us on the Epistle to the Ephesians is of less importance. It belongs to a series which is carefully edited, and, like so much modern exegetical work, is characterized by great industry. The first two chapters of the introduction on Ephesus and St. Paul at Rome are carefully written; that on the authenticity of the Epistle had better have been omitted, or the question should have been properly discussed. A mere assertion that 'St. Paul must have written the Epistle' is of no value from a scientific point of view.

The notes are good, but we occasionally find lapses into pietistic language, which is particularly out of place in writing for schoolboys. For instance, in discussing the final 'Amen,' he says, 'Some very important MSS. omit it. What reader will not supply it from his own spirit?' Such a remark will meet with nothing but ridicule from a schoolboy, and will deserve it. Occasionally we detect the writer's theological opinions in an unnecessary place—the note on page 101 protesting against disproportionate theories of the Sacraments, and drawing attention to the silence concerning Holy Communion, is as much out of place as would be a note drawing attention to the absence of any allusion to Justification by Faith in the theological portion of the epistle.

THE v
to adv
done,
cause.
affecta
always
appeal
men m
utteran

Th
tures b
in asse
fuse th
God;
are in
(p. 17)
would
'new l
conver
suprem
necess
growth
Cook's
'such
choic
'regen
(pp. 1

'It
defined
second
of conv
until h

Here v
our co
we find
'man's
indicat
memor

'Th
Lord's
behind
of bap
supper.

But we
or pres
reign o

Vital Orthodoxy. By the Rev. JOSEPH COOK. 'Boston Monday Lectures, Preludes, &c.,' for 1886. (London: R. D. Dickinson, 1886.)

THE well-known author of the *Boston Monday Lectures* is not seen to advantage in the present series. As an apologist Mr. Cook has done, and we trust will continue to do, excellent service in the Christian cause. Despite his mannerisms, and what we fear must be called his affectations, his apologetic lectures are well worth reading. There is always something to be learned from their clear logic and fearless appeal to the teaching of genuine science and philosophy. But Churchmen must not expect to find much that is satisfactory in Mr. Cook's utterances on the doctrines which distinguish them from the sects.

The central question announced for discussion in the eight lectures before us is, 'What saves men, and why?' Mr. Cook is clear in asserting the necessity of regeneration, and is careful not to confuse this with conversion. 'Regeneration,' he says, 'is the gift of God; conversion is the act of man.' He adds, however, that 'they are inseparable sides of the one great change of the new birth' (p. 17). We do not wish to quarrel about the use of terms, but it would be surely more accurate to say that 'regeneration' and the 'new birth' are merely different names for the same thing, and that conversion, which Mr. Cook defines as 'the turning of the will from supreme love of self and the world to supreme love of God,' is the necessary complement of the new birth if this is to issue in life and growth. But when we look a little more closely, we find that Mr. Cook's notion of regeneration is very incomplete. He defines it as 'such a change in the sinner's nature as results in his first holy choice' (p. 16). And he seems to think that the difference between 'regeneration' and 'prevenient grace' is merely one of phraseology (pp. 16, 18). He says further:—

'It is not safe to assert that man is the sole cause of conversion, defined even in the narrow way as distinct from regeneration. He is a secondary cause of it, an instrumental cause of it; but the first cause even of conversion is God; and no one, of course, can put forth a holy choice until his nature is regenerated.' (P. 17.)

Here we have at any rate a clear assertion of the need of grace. But our confidence in the clearness of the author's view is shaken when we find him quoting with apparent acceptance the statement that 'man's nature itself is grace' (pp. 16, 17). And there is nothing to indicate that he regards the sacraments as anything more than commemorative symbols. He says:—

'The two chief sacraments instituted by Christ were Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These are the oldest Gospels. What doctrines lie behind these institutions? The doctrine of the New Birth behind that of baptism; the doctrine of the Atonement behind that of the Lord's supper.' (P. 56.)

But we gather that all that is here meant is that the sacraments imply or presuppose these doctrines, just as they also imply 'the perpetual reign of the Holy Spirit,' and 'the necessity of immediate repentance.'

Mr. Cook disclaims the attempt to exhibit a perfect theory of the Atonement, but we can hardly think that his discussion of this mysterious subject throws any real light upon it. He repudiates as insufficient the view that the death of Christ is effectual only by virtue of its moral influence. He asserts that it was a vicarious death, an expiation, a sacrifice. But he does little to clear up the difficulties which cluster round these terms. Our personal demerit, he says, is not transferred to Christ, but our guilt 'in the sense of liability to suffer to maintain the honour of a violated law' is so transferred. And he adds: 'It is by looking on Him who has made the transference that we are melted, lifted out of a life of sin, by seeing that a way has been provided to deliver us from the guilt of it' (pp. 50, 51). Thus the moral influence is, after all, relied upon for the deliverance of man from his sin.

Mr. Cook, it must be added, has evidently no conception of the Church as a society founded by Christ on a definite basis of organization, and with an apostolic mission, guaranteed by continuity in the succession of its duly appointed ministers. He remarks that 'the Evangelical hand has these five fingers: Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians,' and adds, 'We think in one way on fundamental questions of theology. Let us maintain Evangelical unity' (pp. 109, 110). In the lecture entitled 'The Church for the Times,' Mr. Cook points to Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle as one of the best examples of such an institution, and urges that 'the Churches' should 'maintain the five orders of religious labourers—apostles, prophets, evangelists, preachers, and teachers' (p. 97). He gives no hint as to the manner in which these are to be appointed, or their functions defined.

To the lectures are appended, as usual, Mr. Cook's 'Preludes,' most of which are merely of local interest. One, however, contains a sketch of the life of Mr. J. B. Gough; and another, entitled 'Low Morals in High Places,' deals with the subjects brought before the public by 'Mr. Stead, the heroic editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*,' who, according to Mr. Cook, was 'thrown into prison on the flimsiest technicality' (p. 175).

At the end of the volume is also printed a singularly uninteresting 'Symposium on the Christian Soteriology.' We do not know, by the way, why the answers given by a number of American theological professors and others to a question circulated among them should be called a 'Symposium.'

A Comparative View of Church Organization, Primitive and Protestant. By the Rev. JAMES H. RIGG, D.D. (London: Woolmer, 1887.)

It cannot certainly be complained that Dr. Rigg's defence of Wesleyan Methodism is not of a most comprehensive character. The Primitive Church, Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, and Congregationalism are successively passed under review with the aim of showing that no communion whatever had rightly grasped the principles of the teaching of Christ and the Apostles until Wesleyanism arose in the eighteenth

century. Dr. Rigg does not indeed condescend to argue the question as against the Church of Rome. But whatever he lacks in breadth of scope he makes up in thoroughness; for the last chapter of his book explains that this singular distinction of having alone preserved free from admixture the vital essence of Christianity is limited to what we may call the orthodox Methodists—that is, Wesleyans strictly so called—as opposed to the numerous sects which have split from the parent stem while retaining in one form or another the name of Methodism.

The one prominent feature in the Apostolic Church of Dr. Rigg's conception is its 'fellowship'; the one test by which he measures the respective claims of Churches to allegiance is the recognition of this 'fellowship' as an integral element in their presentation of Christianity. The organization of the Church of England, even 'on any evangelical or spiritual ground'—even, that is, if the High Church position is abandoned in favour of a minimizing estimate of the Church—is 'exceedingly defective—defective because the Church as organized is devoid of a godly lay-fellowship.' The 'unevangelical and unprimitive condition of things' in the Church of England is 'the direct result of the want of a spiritual and truly mutual lay-fellowship. And almost every other disability and evil under which the Church suffers arises from the same cause.' Nor is it the Church of England only which fails to fulfil the test. 'So far as official recognition and organized provision for spiritual service and co-operation were concerned, the claims and laws of lay-fellowship were as completely ignored in Presbyterianism as in Anglican Episcopacy.' 'We would fain hope that in that respect in which it has been especially wanting in the past . . . in respect of free and mutual spiritual fellowship for its members, the enfranchised Presbyterianism of the future will conform to primitive principles.' But if Dr. Rigg thus cherishes some anticipations of an improvement in this vital respect on the original principles of Presbyterianism, the case stands in exactly the reverse position with the Congregationalists. 'The Church organization of Congregational Independency rests far less on a basis of spiritual character and experience at the present time than it did eighty, or even fifty, years ago. . . . The experimental religious qualification has in many congregations diminished with a steady continuity. . . . Under these circumstances, what is to become in future of the spiritual qualification of the Church member?'

But it is time to ask more definitely what it is that Dr. Rigg means by his doctrine of 'fellowship,' and on what ground he bases his appeal on its behalf to Apostolic Christianity? And it soon becomes evident that this doctrine, as it unfolds itself before Dr. Rigg's imagination, is not a simple, but rather an excessively complex, one. It is essentially lay: 'Where the members of the fellowship are all merely passive, where none teach or speak or offer vocal prayer but the priest, pastor, or minister, there is no trace left of likeness to the original fellowship of Christian believers.' It is experimental: 'Experience—vivid and inspiring experience—is essential to the life and character of Methodism,' just as 'experimental witness-bearing' was

at the foundation of all the primitive charismata. It is godly, that is to say, it has no relation to the ordinary baptized Christian as such, but is based on a Church within the Church, an aristocracy of converted and specially professed believers; which in turn 'implies' (what we are led to understand the Church of England does not possess) 'converted and spiritual ministers.' It will be observed that we have here three distinct characteristics, each of which it is necessary, on Dr. Rigg's theory of the universal obligation of the system, that we should find foreshadowed in the Apostolic Age; but, strangely enough, not more than part of one short chapter of twenty pages is devoted to the question, and only the first of the three points is really grappled with, and even that inadequately.

'It is impossible to read the account given in Acts iv. 23-31 with attention and an open mind without perceiving that "their own company," to which Peter and John, with the healed cripple, returned after their dismissal from before the Sanhedrim, were not only "all filled with the Holy Ghost," but all "spake the word with boldness." As on the Day of Pentecost, so afterwards in that Church, the Spirit of testimony rested on all the believers without regard to office or ordination. So when persecution broke out, and the disciples were all "scattered abroad," they "went everywhere preaching the Word."'

Now for ourselves we are equally ready to assert it to be 'impossible to read' the account 'with attention and an open mind' without seeing that since 'all' they which spoke at Pentecost were Galileans, they must have been the Apostles only, and that since those 'who were "all" filled with the Holy Ghost and spake the word with boldness' are contrasted with 'the multitude of them that believe' of the next verse (iv. 32)—just as they 'all' who were in Solomon's Porch are contrasted with 'the rest' in verse 12—the reference is again to the Twelve and to the Twelve alone. And when the Acts proceed to tell us that they were 'all' scattered except the Apostles, since it is plainly impossible that the whole body of Christians were struck at and the leaders alone spared, we take St. Luke to mean simply that all the officers of the Church, except the Apostles, whose conservative standpoint secured for them the toleration of the Pharisees, were dispersed by the persecution.

On the other two points Dr. Rigg is brief, and we shall follow his example. He tells us that experimental witness-bearing 'formed the staple of the uttered fellowship of these first believers;' but whatever 'a psalm, a teaching, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation' were, experimental or subjective was just what we may safely say they were not. He states again that the treatment of the Donatist controversy shows that the idea of the godly lay-fellowship had died out before that time, since St. Augustine assumes that 'the great majority of the members of the Church were notoriously men of ungodly character and evil lives.' We do not understand Dr. Rigg to be supporting the Donatist theory that none but the godly might be members of the Church, a view which might indubitably appeal to some primitive authority; but we gather that he distinguishes 'the organized body of godly communicants' from the mass of baptized

Christians, a view which we venture to say cannot appeal to a shred of Scriptural witness or a particle of apostolic tradition. Even the gnos̄is and faith of the Alexandrines, itself a later development, is a classification of a different character, and certainly implies no moral slur on the less highly gifted Christian.

The second chapter on the organization of the Primitive Church, together with the two chapters of Anglicanism which it introduces, will, of course, contain the matter of most interest to English Churchmen. And although Dr. Rigg's tone towards the Church of England as a whole is one of cordial sympathy—although he expresses unstinted admiration of her good works and ungrudging recognition of her claim to be the most learned Church in Christendom—although he distinctly disclaims opposition to her retention of the threefold ministry—although there is little that he urges of Church reform that we could not welcome—there is with all this a reservation that vitiates his entire attitude. Anything which he can construe into an exclusive claim on the Church's behalf rouses at once his bitterest animadversion, and he singles out High Churchmen (though we are confident he would not get much comfort from many who would yet not style themselves High Churchmen) as the obvious recipients for his anathemas. It does not appear to occur to him that the claims of one Church can possibly exclude those of another, or that if one is right the other must be wrong. That Christ founded a society which He meant to last to the end of the world, that He provided for its permanent government through the Apostles, that His great prayer was that His disciples should be one; that they who rend the seamless garment take on themselves any responsibility, or that there is such a sin as schism—all this, which is the A B C of every instructed Churchman, is foreign to the sphere of Dr. Rigg's religious conceptions, and the absence of it necessarily colours his whole treatment, whether of diverse sects or of the subdivisions of Methodism itself. Necessarily thus the *doctrine* of the apostolic succession is distasteful to him, but still he need not have committed himself to the unhistorical denial of the *fact*. Whether the ministry can only be validly transmitted by those who have themselves received the laying on of hands (and so right back to the beginning), and whether, if so, the succession must be Episcopal or may be Presbyterian, these are questions, of course, on which men may differ. But that 'the clergy of the Church of England can trace their connexion with the Apostles by links, not one of which is wanting, from the times of St. Paul and St. Peter to our own,' seems to us, as a matter of history, at the very least so much more probable than not, that we can but suppose Dr. Rigg's prejudices have, in this instance, overcome his candour. He supports himself, indeed, on the authority of Macaulay; but Macaulay, though he had read a great deal on theology, understood, we are bound to say, very little of it, and the celebrated passage in the essay on Mr. Gladstone's *Church and State*¹ contains at least three gross errors. 'If no evidence were admitted but that which is

¹ Pp. 486-488 of the *Critical and Historical Essays*.

furnished by the genuine Christian literature of the first two centuries, judgment would not go in favour of prelacy.' It almost takes away one's breath when we read that Macaulay is persuaded that his opponent would agree with him in this estimate, but then (though we do not know whether he similarly obviated the witness of Irenæus) we fancy we remember some passage in Macaulay's writings where he assumes the spuriousness of Ignatius. In the second place Macaulay was clearly of opinion that the unworthiness of the minister affected the validity of the orders he imparted, and that an interlude of Arian bishops would destroy the claim of succession from the Apostles. Thirdly, we gather from his quotation from Chillingworth that Macaulay either forgot the rule (dating at the latest from Nicaea) of consecration by three bishops, or if he knew it, as we doubt not he did, erroneously believed that the lack of true episcopacy in any one of them would vitiate the ceremony. If Dr. Rigg shares the misconceptions of Lord Macaulay we can understand his language, but on that supposition only.

We have left ourselves no space to speak at length of the rest of Dr. Rigg's work, but we cannot conclude our account without calling attention to what is really an extremely able criticism of the chief principles of Congregational Independency (p. 172, *sqq.*), the confusion of the Kingdom of Christ with human commonwealths, the inconsistent position of the ministry, and the isolation of congregations and entire lack of organic unity. When Dr. Rigg criticizes he is well worth reading, and that Churchmen at least are not afraid of criticism or ashamed to profit by it the whole history of the last few years will testify; but unfortunately when Dr. Rigg has to speak of that side of the Church of England which is represented in the *Church Quarterly Review* he abandons criticism and degenerates into abuse.

Les Sentiments Moraux au Seizième Siècle. Par ALBERT DESJARDINS. (Paris: Pedone-Lauriell, 1887.)

ALTHOUGH the history of the Reformation and of the causes which led to it has often been described by competent writers, the interest it has excited seems rather to gain in strength than otherwise, if it was only from the fact that in the opinion of many thinkers a further reformation both in the religious world, and in the sphere of thought generally, is not only necessary but imminent. M. Albert Desjardins is the most recent Frenchman who has grappled with the subject, and although he has confined his researches to his own country, his volume deserves to be read by all who take an interest in the welfare of society.

The state of France at the beginning of the sixteenth century, viewed in the family, the government, the court, the various branches of the public service—such are the topics which M. Desjardins has undertaken to treat, and which it seems to us he has treated with much success, and before entering into details he makes two or three general observations, the only ones upon which we propose dwelling here.

Till the outbreak of the Reformation, Rome had been regarded as the centre of the moral world, and it was towards the Vatican all

eyes were turned for the solution of the manifold problems which affect the life of man. Now, however, that by the means of war, diplomacy, and commercial enterprise easy intercourse was established between France and Italy, the prestige which had for so many ages surrounded Roman Catholicism had begun to wear away. What right, some enquirers boldly asked, has the Pope to put forth his pretensions as the Vicar of God on earth? Why should we feel bound to obey blindly the dictates of men who often lead the most scandalous lives, and whose conduct is actuated in many cases by the grossest ambition and the most unblushing rapacity? What intellectual benefit (to take no higher ground) can we derive from a teaching the outcome of which is the scholastic nonsense of an Ockham and a Gabriel Biel?

The questions thus put by M. Desjardins are, everyone must acknowledge, difficult to be answered and well calculated to perplex the weak and the unlearned. Further, there was the fact that the Papacy visited with its excommunications many a sincere Christian who ventured to think for himself, to read the Scriptures, and to cultivate habits of practical piety in what the Church regarded as an unauthorized fashion.

The Renaissance movement, coming just at that time, added a fresh element of doubt to an apparently insoluble problem. Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Epictetus, Seneca, Cicero began to be studied and appreciated. Now the question would naturally suggest itself, Were all these men, patterns of virtue and wisdom, condemned to everlasting destruction just because they were born beyond the influence of Christianity? Further, are not the principles which actuated them in their noble lives sufficient for us, and need we go to other sources for direction and advice? The field of discussion had thus become considerably widened, and from challenging the authority of the Pope men had ventured to call in question the authority of Christianity itself.

This state of confusion, this moral and intellectual chaos, explains the character of the sixteenth century not only in France, but throughout Europe; M. Desjardins has not touched upon the Reformation, and so far his volume, pre-eminently interesting as it is, lacks completeness; he gives us only one side of the picture.

Études sur la Révocation de l'Édit de Nantes. Par F. PUAUX et A. SABATIER. (Paris: Granart, 1886.)

THE Revocation of the Edict of Nantes is one of those events on which there cannot be now two opinions, and there are few members of the Roman Catholic clergy themselves who would hesitate to stamp it as one of the most fatal and ill-judged measures that ever were devised. The commemoration of it in the course of last year could not but suggest a number of publications; no writer, so far as we know, attempted to defend it, and, on the Protestant side, several *brochures* and goodly volumes appeared, in which it was the intention of the authors to point out (1) the iniquitous character of the measure; (2) its failure; (3) the disastrous results it produced

for France ; and, finally, the terrible responsibility which rests upon the Gallican clergy. One of these volumes, contributed by MM. Puaux and Sabatier, is now before us, and deserves a brief notice here.

It is curious to remark what a variety of opinions there exists on the question, Who is answerable for the Revocation? Some say Bossuet, others Louvois ; a few name the Pope, most Louis XIV. and Madame de Maintenon. M. Puaux pronounces a sentence of condemnation against the Roman Catholic clergy. Whilst adopting this opinion we must add that they found in Louis XIV. a tool quite ready to encourage and support them in their fanaticism ; that monarch tells us himself in his Memoirs that ever since he ascended the throne he had firmly resolved upon establishing uniformity of religion through his dominions, and there is no doubt that the recollection of the Fronde, whilst it made him detest political opposition of any kind, led him to suppose that in matters of conscience he had also the right of enforcing obedience. Two points are especially dwelt upon by M. Puaux—first, the scrupulous desire which the King entertained of seeming to aid within the strict limits of legality in suppressing one by one all the rights granted by Henry IV. to the Huguenots ; and, secondly, the care he took, on his death bed, of making the prelates answerable for all the religious measures adopted during his reign.

M. Sabatier deals particularly with the Jesuits, and traces back to their action not only the ruin of Protestantism in France, but all the social and political convulsions which have disturbed the country for the last century and a half, and which cannot be said to have yet disappeared.

The third and last piece which makes up the volume we have reviewed is a reprint of the final petition addressed to Louis XIV. by his Protestant subjects. It has only been recently discovered amongst the MSS. of the Paris Archives Nationales, and is now published by M. Puaux with an introduction and notes.

Symbolæ ad illustrandam Historiam Ecclesiæ Orientalis in Terris Coronæ Sancti Stephani. Auct. NICOL. NILLES, S.J. (Cenipontæ : F. Rauch, 1886.)

THE curious work for which we are indebted to Father Nilles does not address itself to the common run of readers ; not only has it no literary pretensions whatever, but it is so clumsily and so imperfectly put together that, were it not for the copious index by which it is completed, the student would have some difficulty in finding his way through it. We are justified in looking at it as a collection of materials to be subsequently arranged and reduced into shape ; and we earnestly wish that our hopes may be realized, for the *Symbolæ* treat of a subject which is now more than ever in everyone's mind—we mean the Balkan peninsula. Any document, any book which bears upon the Eastern question must needs be popular ; and although Father Nilles has not had the slightest idea of writing what our French neighbours call an *ouvrage de circonstance*, yet we are anxious

to k
Dan
stric

und
relat
day
are
to t
take
the
a di
the
que
Chr
by
the
of t
con
labo
que
acco
be i

Les

WE
goo
bee
slov
hav
trus
dep
nea
favo
are
wo
giv
cus
Sc
de
sch
My
wh
our
the
Hi

Dr
at

to know all that can be known respecting the ancient history of the Danubian provinces, considered from the religious as well as the strictly political point of view.

By what train of circumstances were these provinces brought under the authority of the Church of Rome? What have their relations been with the Vatican from the earliest times to the present day? Such is the plan of the *Symbolæ*; the second and third books are devoted to the Roumanians, the fourth to the Servians, the fifth to the Ruthenians and the Armenians, the sixth and last being taken up by the addenda and corrigenda. We have not named the first book, because it serves as an introduction to the rest, and is a discussion on the best means of bringing about a fusion between the Eastern and Latin Churches. We have nothing to say on this question, but merely to remark that the *Latinizing* of the Oriental Christians has for some time and is now more than ever regarded by Roman Catholics as a mistake. Many theologians maintain that the best course for missionaries who work amongst the populations of the Danubian provinces, and generally in the East, would be to conform to the religious rites of those in whose midst they live and labour. Whatever view the reader may adopt on this particular question, he cannot fail to be interested by the mass of information accumulated in the *Symbolæ*, and which, we venture to repeat, would be much more valuable if it was more artistic in form.

Les Œuvres de Hugues de Saint-Victor: Essai Critique. Par B. HAURÉAU, Membre de l'Institut. (Paris: Hachette, 1886.)

WE earnestly wish that some competent scholar would give us a good edition of the works of Hugues de Saint-Victor. They have been six times reprinted, but the last edition, that of 1648, is very slovenly done; and although several of the philosopher's treatises have appeared separately, yet we do not possess even now a really trustworthy edition of the complete writings of a man who by the depth of his learning, the genuine piety which animated him, and the neatness of his style, must ever be regarded as one of the most favourable representatives of mediæval divinity. If ever the task we are now alluding to should be attempted, M. B. Hauréau's monograph would be a great help; Hugues de Saint-Victor's biography is there given with the minutest care, the authenticity of his works is fully discussed, and the erroneous assertions which we find both in the *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiæ Antiquis* of Oudin and in the *Histoire Littéraire de la France* are refuted as they deserve. M. Hauréau is an admirable scholar, but we cannot apply the same epithet to his divinity. Mysticism has its shoals and its quicksands, it is true, and the whole school of Saint-Victor too often leans towards pantheism; but our author, on the other hand, whilst denouncing the tendencies of the Mystics, not unfrequently attacks Christianity.

Histoire Littéraire des Vaudois du Piémont. Par EDOUARD MONTET. (Paris: Fischbacher, 1887.)

DR. MONTET's volume, so far as it goes, deserves nothing but praise; at the same time it scarcely justifies its title. Where we expect to

find a history of literature, we are brought into contact with religious teaching and an account of the forerunners of Protestantism. Dr. Montet begins by giving us a description of the Vaudois MSS. at present extant, the most ancient of which, now at the Munich library, dates as far back as the thirteenth century; it is written in Latin, whereas the others are in the dialect generally designated by the name of *langue vaudoise*. Here our author enters into a number of interesting details on the grammatical peculiarities of that language, or rather dialect, which, Provençal in its origin, differs from those of the troubadours and of the Albigenses, and was subsequently modified by the influence of Italian. So far the *literary* part of Dr. Montet's book; it constitutes the introduction, and prepares us for the theological account which forms the bulk of the work. All historians are agreed that Peter Waldo, or Waldez, who lived during the twelfth century, was the founder of the Waldensian Church: the members of it protested firmly that they were staunch Churchmen; their only aim was to spread the knowledge of the Scriptures, to conform more strictly with the usages and customs of primitive Christianity, and particularly to observe the law of poverty. With the view of carrying on these ideas they maintained the complete liberty of preaching, and did not believe that an official commission granted by the Pope and his delegates was necessary for anyone whose sense of duty led him to expound the Word of God in public. Dr. Montet divides the history of the Waldensian Church into three parts—(1) the Catholic, (2) the Hussite, (3) the Protestant—and he grounds the division not only on the authority of contemporary MSS. but on the alterations which, at various epochs, were made by copyists in transcribing those documents.

Le Talmud de Jérusalem traduit en Français pour la première fois.

Par MOÏSE SCHWAB. Vol. IX. (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1887.)

Two more volumes will suffice for M. Moïse Schwab to complete his French translation of the Talmud; the ninth instalment, which has reached us lately, comprises the end of the treatise *Guitin* and the whole of the treatises *Nadir* and *Qiddouschin*. There is nothing very special to note in this fasciculus except the provoking uncertainty which exists as to the classification of the various parts of the Talmud, some MSS. giving one order, and others adopting an altogether different arrangement. M. Schwab also takes the opportunity of pointing out the advantage of comparing the Talmudic legislation not so much with that of the Romans as with the laws of the Mahometans, the Turks, Arabs, Persians, and the Eastern nations. As an illustration of this fact he refers us to the *Minhadj-al-Talebin* ('Guide of the Zealous Believers'), a manual of Mussulman jurisprudence according to the rite of Chaf'i. An edition of this work containing the Arabic text, translation, and notes was published in three volumes by the Dutch Government at Batavia in 1882-84.

Œuvres complètes de Blaise Pascal. Publiées par M. P. FAUGÈRE. 8vo, vol. i. (Paris and London: L. Hachette & Co., 1887.)

It is much to be regretted that M. Prosper Faugère, who had under-

taken
collec
us be
temp
Jansc
mater
it wou
to Pa
has e
of its
was c
A
striki
text
the fi
the J
Jacqu
ence
with
all hi
mula
M. F
but t
matia
much
piece
incre
were
editio
at Pa
being
Jesui
he h
centu
the s
case
Fren
V
the f
the c
Nico
Latin
volum
vario
taken
Pasc
brou
fairly

taken to publish this new edition of Pascal for M. Hachette's excellent collection, *Les Grands Ecrivains*, should be removed from amongst us before completing his task. No one in the whole range of contemporary French critics was more familiar with Jansenism and Jansenist literature. He may have left behind him the necessary materials for finishing his task, and we earnestly hope he has, because it would be difficult to find out any person more capable to do justice to Pascal. However, we have at present to examine the volume he has edited, and we shall endeavour in a few words to give some idea of its contents, and of the plan according to which the whole edition was conceived.

All those amongst our readers who remember the late M. Cousin's striking report on the necessity of publishing a revised and *correct* text of the illustrious Port Royalist, know well that M. Faugère was the first to give us an *exact* reproduction of the original manuscript of the *Pensées*. He had moreover brought to light the writings of Jacqueline Pascal and Madame Périer, and published the correspondence of La Mère Agnès Arnauld. Encouraged by the success he had met with in these various literary speculations, he resolved upon devoting all his energies to the re-editing of Pascal, and with that view he accumulated a store of materials of which we have now the first instalment. M. Faugère's plan was not to give a general review of Pascal's works, but to prefix to each division—*Provincial Letters*, *Pensées*, *Mathematical and Scientific Treatises*—a separate introduction. It is not too much to say that the disquisition which opens this volume is a masterpiece of criticism; it gives the whole history of the *Provinciales*, the incredible difficulties with which their composition and publication were attended, their bibliography, &c. &c. The first really good edition of Pascal was that of the Abbé Bossut, brought out in 1779 at Paris in five octavo volumes; but even that edition was far from being blameless, for the simple reason that the influence of the Jesuits prevented the learned abbé from giving the actual text, and he had to be satisfied with presenting to the readers of the last century a Pascal toned down, to use a familiar phrase, so as to calm the susceptibilities of the 'reverend fathers.' Now, fortunately, the case is totally different, and we shall have one of the greatest of French thinkers introduced to us in his original dress.

We have already spoken of the preface to the *Lettres Provinciales*; the first twelve of these immortal pamphlets come next, followed by the celebrated *défense*, which, as every one knows, is the work of Nicole, who likewise published, under the name of Wendrock, a Latin translation of the whole series. Each letter, in M. Faugère's volume, is accompanied by brief summaries, elucidated by notes, various readings, and other valuable matter. The editor has also taken care to verify all the passages from the casuists quoted by Pascal, in order to refute the absurd and calumnious accusation brought against him of having garbled these passages and dealt unfairly with them.

La France Protestante. Nouvelle édition. Sixième volume, première partie. 8vo. (Paris : Fischbacher, 1887.)

LIKE M. de Boislisle's *Saint-Simon*, the new edition of the *France Protestante*, at the slow rate of its publication, will be completed only when the present generation has passed away ; in the meanwhile it is a pleasure for us to announce each fresh instalment as it comes from the press, and to note the abundant light it throws, not only upon the history of religion, but upon the progress of literature, science, and art, as well as the political annals of France during the epoch included between the dawn of the Reformation and the present day. The first *livraison* of the sixth volume, quite recently given to the public, is particularly rich in biographical notices of illustrious characters, such as the Estienne, the Farel, Ferry, Eynard, Fontanès, &c. &c. With respect to the Estienne, due attention has been paid not merely to the services they rendered as editors and commentators of the Greek and Latin classics, but as composers and pamphlet writers. Respecting the famous *Discours merveilleux de la vie, actions, et déportements de Catherine de Médicis*, which has long been, and is still by some, ascribed to Robert Estienne, our author, following the opinion of M. Sayous, believes that it is not his work ; and although not positively asserting that Theodore Beza wrote it, he is inclined to adopt this supposition. If, he remarks, we examine other well-known pamphlets of Robert Estienne, namely, the *Apologie pour Hérodoté*, we cannot help feeling convinced that the same author is not responsible for both works. It is extremely probable that the *Discours merveilleux* was composed by some *littérateur* belonging to what was then designated as the *parti des politiques*, that is to say, the moderate group of Protestants and Catholics combined who, assembled round the Duke d'Alençon, wanted to destroy the baneful influence of Catherine de' Medici, and with that view represented her as aiming to *Italianize* France, and to hoist up the banner of Ultramontanism.

Spiritualisme et Libéralisme. Par M. FERRAZ. 8vo.
(Paris : Perrin et Cie., 1887.)

M. FERRAZ is a well-known French metaphysician, whose work on St. Augustine, published some years ago, created a considerable amount of attention as soon as it appeared. A decided and eloquent champion of *spiritualism*, that is to say of theism, he is equally opposed to the doctrines of the materialists of the last century and to the traditionalism of Joseph de Maistre, M. de Bonald, and the Lamennais of the *Essai sur l'Indifférence*. He endorses the programme of the liberal party, and aims throughout his writings at showing that theists are the only true champions of freedom in the best and noblest sense of the word.

The volume we are now noticing is a gallery of portraits, beginning with Madame de Staël, and ending with M. Emile Saisset, who died a comparatively short time ago. Four persons have especially struck us in this collection as being distinctly philosophers, and having devoted their energies and their talent to the *instauration magna* of religious truth which the Revolutionists of 1793 had vainly

ende
disci
simp
and
sive
admi
cont
bette
the r
de B
tians
is ev
biog
Prac
exag
we l
think
tolog
quite
hims
para
iden
repu
Dog
with
mela
drea
Frer
only
Chri
Rev

THE
estin
have
thes
pop
tury
mag
thre

tion
Bod
part
Ara
at
Mai
artic

endeavoured to destroy. The first was Laromiguière, originally a disciple of Condillac, but who soon perceived that the apparent simplicity of materialistic views leaves the problem of man's nature and destiny absolutely unsolved. *Condillacism* is a complete, exclusive system which must be either taken or rejected in its entirety, and admits of no compromise; hence, in Laromiguière's teaching, certain contradictions arising from the author's endeavour to reconcile the better views suggested to him by his reflections with the sophistry of the materialist school. Laromiguière believed in the Deity; Maine de Biran and Ampère went much further—they were decided Christians, and their religious opinions had a *nuance* of mysticism which is evident to those who have read the journal of the former and the biography of the latter, so beautifully written by Madame Cheuvreux. Practical Christianity was M. Guizot's standpoint; it is rather an exaggeration to class him amongst *philosophers*, properly so called, if we limit the meaning of the expression, as they do in France, to thinkers who write *ex professo* on psychology, ontology, and pneumatology. With reference to M. Cousin and M. Jouffroy the case is quite different. The great champion of eclecticism did not trouble himself much about religion, except to assert that it occupied a parallel position to the one held by philosophy, and that it aimed at identical results, though by different means. As to M. Jouffroy, he repudiated Christianity altogether; in his famous essay, *Comment les Dogmes finissent*, for instance, where he took leave of religion, not with the savage spite of a d'Holbach or a Diderot, but with the melancholy feeling of a man who finds himself obliged to give up the dreams of his youth.

The book of M. Ferraz is an excellent guide to the history of French metaphysics during the last fifty years, and it is useful, if only to show us how futile is the attempt to substitute instead of Christianity even the most refined of metaphysical systems.

Revue des Études Juives. Livraison pour Avril-Juin, 1887. 8vo. (Paris: Durlache, 1887.)

THE recent *livraison* of the *Revue des Études Juives* is quite as interesting as any of the preceding ones. In the domain of history we have observed some notes on the condition of the Jews in Spain; these notes refer chiefly to the persecution which the Israelitish population had to undergo towards the end of the fourteenth century, the districts in which they were allowed to reside, their schools, magistrates, and the position of those amongst them who had under threats received the sacrament of baptism.

The philological part of this *brochure* contains a critical examination of the treatise of Pora preserved amongst the treasures of the Bodleian Library. The manuscript of which this treatise forms a part is the *Pérusch Hammischna* of Moses Maimonides written in the Arabic text; it is evidently very old, for, according to a note inserted at the end of each volume, it was revised and corrected from Maimonides' original. If we may believe M. Lambert, author of the article we are now examining, the scribe who is responsible for this

copy of the Pora treatise does not seem to have been very learned, and he did not invariably understand his text, as will appear quite evident from the blunders he makes in the use of vowel points; this drawback, however, is compensated by the fact that the copyist was not a prejudiced person, wedded to a particular system, and we are quite sure of having the pronunciation of the Mischna as it was current in the Yemen—the province where, most probably, the *codex* in question was written.

Under the heading *actes et conférences* we have remarked two interesting lectures delivered in Paris during the course of last spring: the one, by M. Sacher-Masoch, treats of the Jewish sects in Galicia; the other, by the celebrated Egyptian scholar, M. Maspero, refers to the state of Syria before the arrival of the Israelites. It is particularly important because it shows in what a satisfactory manner the literature of hieroglyphs completes and supplements the details given by the Holy Scriptures on the nationalities with which the people of God were brought into contact.

L'Allemagne et la Réforme. Par JEAN JANSSEN. Traduit de l'Allemand sur la quatorzième édition, avec une préface de M. G. A. Heinrich. 8vo. (Paris: Plon, 1887.)

THIS French translation of M. Janssen's celebrated work is admirably done, and it commends itself to our attention in consequence of the preface added to it by M. Heinrich, late senior professor of the Lyons *Faculté des Lettres*. Every reader interested in ecclesiastical history has heard of the sensation caused by M. Janssen's monograph, and the fact of its having reached a fourteenth edition within the space of a few years shows that the author had touched upon a sore point in the present state of Germany. Fancy a son of the *Fatherland* boldly asserting that the Reformation of the sixteenth century was not a principle of new life, the commencement of a bright era, a stage of progress; but, on the contrary, a perturbation, a lowering both of the intellectual and the moral level, a diminution of the general well-being and of national prosperity. Such an hypothesis was simply scandalous, and a whole legion of critics rose up to refute it. There is no denying the fact that, as M. Emile de Laveleye demonstrated a few years ago, the Protestant nations of Europe are, in every respect, far in advance of the Catholic ones; but the question is whether this progress contains the elements of durability, whether it is likely to last. M. Heinrich, following in the wake of M. Janssen, thinks not. The Protestants, sincerely attached to the doctrines of Luther and the reformed faith, find themselves now backed by the apostles of freethought and the revolutionists of every *nuance*. The unconscious pioneers who threw overboard the tenets of the Catholic Church fondly believed that they were by so doing merely clearing a road for the progress of the unadulterated Gospel; they have, on the contrary, as a matter of fact, helped on the triumph of *philosophy*, and freed mankind from faith in a revelation. The singular mixture of unintelligible mysticism and of rash negation which constitutes the leading characteristic of the German mind.

foun
henc
appe
Fran
exact
dates
see a
At th
part
a few
on i
once
I
giving
up r
The
prov
best
who

Corr

WH
scep
Muc
grat
Carl
mal
had
inwa
two
of th
to a
and
the
that
or
Thu
Kar
Ath
cer
fact
app
all.
Go
inte
two
for
Th
bec

found in the sixteenth-century Reformation its true embodiment ; hence the perfect storm which M. Janssen's book created on its first appearance. M. Heinrich compares it to M. Taine's *Origines de la France contemporaine*, and shows that the tendency of both works is exactly the same. As in the opinion of most Frenchmen that country dates properly from 1789, so the great majority of Germans cannot see any *Fatherland* before the meeting of the Diet of Worms in 1521. At the commencement of both crises there was no intention on the part of the innovators to destroy the edifice, but merely to introduce a few necessary reforms ; however, as each one began experiments on it at a separate part, the building, undermined on all sides at once, easily gave way and covered the ground with ruins.

It seems to us perfectly clear that the time has come at last for giving up a good many notions amidst which we have been brought up respecting both the Reformation and the French Revolution. The sensation created by the works of M. Janssen and M. Taine proves this in the most irresistible manner, and shows that the best causes are frequently spoilt through the imprudence of those who originated them.

Correspondence between Goethe and Carlyle. Edited by CHARLES ELIOT NORTON. (London : Macmillan and Co., 1887.)

WHEN in 1826 Carlyle found that he had at last 'conquered all his scepticisms,' and overthrown, for his own part, the 'soul-murdering Mud-gods' of the epoch, it was to Goethe that he looked with gratitude for this great deliverance. But what Goethe had to give Carlyle that could be of service to his special form of mental malady it is not at first sight easy to see. Goethe, indeed, had also had his period of spiritual anguish and conflict, but with him the inward strife was waged between passion and law—with Carlyle between doubt and belief, the word of the understanding and the word of the reason. This Kantian phraseology will recur again and again to anyone who tries to express the course of Carlyle's mental history, and, in fact, were it not for his own constant and direct testimony to the services rendered him by Goethe, it might be easily supposed that the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* had far more to do than *Faust* or *Wilhelm Meister* with that notable victory over the mud-gods. Thus in Carlyle's essay on Novalis (1829) he distinctly claims for Kant's philosophy that it had cut away the standing-ground of Atheism, and made possible that high spiritual faith which he discerned in the new German literature. And yet it is an historical fact that of all the eminent figures in that literature, not one was apparently less influenced by Kant than the most eminent of them all. All metaphysicians were, as such, more or less obnoxious to Goethe : for Kant in particular even Schiller tried in vain to win his interest. How different must have been the services which these two teachers rendered to Carlyle ! And if Kant confuted Atheism for him, what then did Goethe do ? What could Goethe do more ? The fact seems to be that their services, different as they must have been, and in fact were, were yet complementary. Kant gave Carlyle

a creed ; Goethe gave him a gospel. And Goethe's gospel was simply the revelation of himself. He showed to Carlyle what Carlyle needed not merely to know by demonstration, but to see realized in a living example, that the attitude of reverence for what is above, around, and beneath us, was still possible to a thinking man of that epoch. What greater service could be rendered to a noble yet distracted soul? and yet one feels that there is something immoderate in the gratitude which Carlyle expresses so fervently throughout his works, and still more unrestrainedly in this correspondence. Religion with Goethe never became more than a sentiment, an *aiōthōsis*. By such a religion such a man in such circumstances as his could live and work without moral shipwreck ; yet his excessive love of 'quiet culture ;' his studied indifference to all that was catastrophic, violent, abnormal ; utterances like his 'Niemand wandelt ungestraft unter Palmen'—are these not signs of a weakness, a limitation? In an orderly familiar world where seedtime is visibly followed by harvest, and men are seen to thrive or fail by their own qualities, it may be possible to live by sentiment, by *Ehrfurcht*, without the intellectual conviction on which this should properly be based. But without such an intellectual conviction of Deity, impregnable and supreme, forming an appellate court of infinite jurisdiction, could sincere souls ever have given us such presentations of victorious failure as we have in Shakespeare's Cordelia, in Carlyle's Madame Roland, or, to take a much less tragic instance, in the *Life of John Sterling*? This conviction Carlyle assuredly had, and assuredly he did not gain it from Goethe. Yet he may well have thought he did. It is a noteworthy fact that twice at least—once in the correspondence before us—Carlyle misquotes Goethe's famous maxim, 'Im Ganzen, Guten, Schönen, resolut zu leben,' by writing *Wahren* for *Schönen*. The misquotation was doubtless in both cases unintentional, but it is all the more significant.

As to these *Letters* it cannot be said that they throw much new light on the relations between the writers—much light that an attentive student of the works of both could not already have gained. But certainly to listen to the interchange of thought and affection between two such men is to breathe a high and ennobling atmosphere. The correspondence was carried on, with occasional long intervals of silence, during the last six years of Goethe's life. It had its rise in the presentation to him by Carlyle of a copy of the latter's translation of *Wilhelm Meister's Lehrjahre*. The message of homage and admiration with which it was accompanied awakened a ready response in Goethe, who soon perceived that this young Scotch essayist was 'a moral force of great significance.'¹ The first clear manifestation of this marvellous force was in the manner in which Carlyle revolutionized English public opinion on the subject of German literature. The progress of this revolution in taste can be traced very clearly by the help of these *Letters*, and of the comments and extracts judiciously given

¹ Eckermann.

us by their editor. It is interesting, too, to observe how Carlyle's mission of *Vermittler*, or interpreter, once faithfully fulfilled, gave place to the new mission of the seer. 'When I look at the wonderful chaos within me,' writes Carlyle (August 31, 1830), 'full of natural Supernaturalism, and all manner of Antediluvian fragments; and how the Universe is daily growing more mysterious as well as more august, and the influences from without more heterogeneous and perplexing; I see not well what is to come of it all, and only conjecture from the violence of the fermentation that something strange may come.' Strange enough truly! *Sartor Resartus* was the first thing that came.

Let no reader of these *Letters* fail to render due gratitude to Mr. Norton for his invaluable work as editor and translator. So little does his own personality appear therein, that one is in danger of underestimating the toil, the learning and the accuracy with which the needful help and information are given. Goethe's letters are presented both in the original and in a careful and fluent translation; and, in short, it may be said that nothing has been left undone to render the book intelligible and useful to English readers.

The Life of John Wesley. By JOHN TELFORD, B.A.
(London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1886.)

THIS book might be most aptly described as a cento of anecdotes and extracts. The author has apparently also written a work called *Wesley Anecdotes*, and the volume before us is of much the same character. The Introduction, on Wesley's position, consists, not of an attempt to estimate it, but of a series of extracts from eminent historians which remind one of nothing so much as the opinions of the press inserted in advertisements of books—'the greatest historian of the eighteenth century says,' 'the late lamented J. R. Green says,' and so on.

The literary value of the remainder of the book is about on the same level. The reader will find no adequate statement of Wesley's theological position; his ecclesiastical position is very scantily treated. We are left in considerable doubt as to the teaching of Law, of the Moravians, of the other influences which helped to shape his career. Of his teaching on most points we learn nothing. Nor again do we learn much about his personal character.

On the other hand, the book is crowded with facts which show indeed considerable industry in compilation, but not much skill in arrangement. The usual custom is to begin each paragraph in some such way as this: 'In April 1770, when he was in the highlands,' and then follows an anecdote. So many anecdotes go to the chapter.

One great merit the book has on which we must heartily commend the author. Though he clearly writes from a Dissenting point of view, he shows a large amount of self-restraint in writing about the Church. There are passages undoubtedly which a churchman will hardly agree with, but there are none which can offend him. The state of the Church in the last century (though the evils have been very much exaggerated) unquestionably affords plenty of oppor-

tunity for attacks on it. Mr. Telford shows no tendency to be led astray. He never indulges in one acrimonious word or one uncharitable remark, and he exercises considerable reserve in the praise he bestows on the Wesleyan body.

The book adds little or nothing either to our knowledge or appreciation of Wesley; it is not distinguished for literary skill: but there is no doubt that for readers whom it suits, *i.e.* those persons who find an anecdote about Wesley an unfailing resource in sermons and speeches, it will be a most convenient book.

Selections from Papers of the Twining Family. Edited by RICHARD TWINING. (London: John Murray, 1887.)

IN a former number of this *Review* (vol. xv. p. 499) we called attention to a very interesting volume of *Recreations and Studies* of the Rev. Thomas Twining. We rejoice to find that his descendant, Mr. Richard Twining, has been encouraged to give us a yet further selection from the Twining papers. The book is not very learned or very witty or very exciting: it is a refined and lifelike account of travelling when travelling was not so common as it is now, in a stage of society which has completely passed away. We do not know any book which we could so heartily commend for whiling away a spare half-hour.

The Rev. Thomas Twining is known as a scholar at the end of the last century of some reputation, who published a translation and notes to Aristotle's *Poetics* which are still in more regular use than most old editions of the classics. The present book contains extracts from the journals that he kept while travelling on the Continent, before the old society of the small States of Germany had been washed away by the French Revolution. He visited many places of interest, and travelling with good introductions saw many interesting persons. He visits Spa and gives a lifelike description of the very mixed society of the place. He travelled through various parts of England. He was in Paris in 1786; at Göttingen and Brunswick in 1788. Another member of the family was for many years in India in the Bengal Civil Service, and under his guidance we are introduced to the Great Mogul. We also make the acquaintance of the German scholar Heyne, and the English Dr. Parr; of many German princes who took advantage of the independence of their position to develop the peculiarities of their character; and of other interesting persons.

The following extract may amuse some of our readers:—

'I was engaged in looking at these fine people when a gentleman and lady came whirling by and had almost overwhelmed me. I could not imagine what they were about. I could scarcely extricate myself from the danger with which they threatened me, when another and another couple came twisting by in like manner. I found on inquiry that this is a favourite German dance—called a waltz.'

He then goes on to describe what it is like.

Altogether we can recommend this book as a very good example of a pleasant form of light literature. We may add that it is not so interesting towards the end.

The Autobiography of an Independent Minister.

(London : Williams and Norgate, 1887.)

IN its present form the work before us is, like a greater Apologia, a history, and, because a history, a defence of the process of abandoning the ministry of one communion for the ministry of another. But it differs from its famous counterpart in having been for the most part written, although not published, before the author had taken the decisive step of secession ; indeed, when, about the end of 1881—more than two years after he had finally exchanged Congregationalism for the Church of England—the first part of this Autobiography was given (anonymously, we suppose) to the public, one reviewer remarked that ‘the “Independent Minister” . . . has written an interesting book, not the less so because he has not in the least lost faith in his system.’ Such a mistake is of course impossible now, when the progress of events is carried down to the actual resignation of the writer’s pastorate, and the disguise, transparent enough before, we should think, to those who knew him, is entirely dropped in the preface, which Mr. Martyn—who is now, we believe, licensed in the diocese of Rochester—signs in full, while the newspaper extracts there quoted show that ‘Langton,’ the scene of his labours, ‘a large manufacturing town in the north of England,’ of a population ‘little short of 100,000 souls,’ and of ‘true blue’ politics, represents, as indeed these data might have enabled us to guess, Preston in Lancashire.

The history of Mr. Martyn’s—or perhaps we ought to say Mr. ‘Wilkinson’s’—troubles has almost a pathetic interest. We shall pass over the earlier chapters, which describe his life at an Independent college and his first pastorate (at Newport, in the Isle of Wight), and turn at once to the account of his fifteen years’ stay at Preston, and the terrible experience of the evils of Congregational Independency which it brought with it. That Mr. Martyn possessed in an increasing degree during his whole stay the confidence of his own people and the respect of his townsmen, is proved by the testimonials of the leading newspapers on the occasion of his resignation, and by the steady growth alike in the income, the congregation, and the communicants of his church. Here were all the elements of harmonious work. Yet during the greater part of the time the pastor was the victim of a relentless persecution on the part of a small minority of his community, which was only terminated in the end by resort to the extreme process of expulsion of the leading malcontents. We of the Church of England have often been accused, and with too much justice, of discouraging the co-operation of the faithful laity with the clergy ; and we are doing our best to clear ourselves of the reproach. But whatever steps we may take to attain our end, Mr. Martyn’s experience of Independency will supply us with some useful hints as how *not* to do it. Theoretically the Congregational principle is most desirable, which co-ordinates with the minister for the purposes of financial and general management certain elected representatives of the church members ; but a system is eminently unsatisfactory in practice if it enables objectionable individuals to maintain this representative position for an unnamed period of time against the all but

unanimous feeling of those whom they are supposed to represent, and provides, apparently, no machinery for getting rid of them short of actual exclusion from the community. Theoretically there is something not unattractive in entrusting every member of the congregation of each church with a voice in its affairs; practically it becomes an intolerable nuisance when even men who have failed, hopelessly failed, in so far winning the confidence of their fellow members as to obtain election into the body of 'deacons' can still utilize the 'church meeting' to worry their minister's life out of him.

Mr. Martyn suffered in both these ways. His 'diaconate' included from the first two worthies who appear under the appropriate *noms de plume* of 'Mr. Teazer' and 'Mr. Rowdyson.' Mr. Teazer was the typical Dissenter, who having started life as a tailor had married money and his master's daughter, and set up in the woollen-drapery business, posing on the strength of it all as the indispensable patron of the church. Mr. Rowdyson was a gentleman whose intelligence was just sufficient to qualify him to second Mr. Teazer; and his kindly feeling to his minister was illustrated by his remark of a former pastor, that he would 'sooner work with the Devil than with Mr. Davids.' What Mr. Martyn endured at their hands we must leave it to his own narrative to tell. But his people were with him, and when the Teazer faction (with the exception of Mr. Teazer himself, too wary to run the risk) withdrew from the diaconate, in the expectation that their resignations would be promptly refused by the church, they were astonished to find them accepted without hesitation. But there still remained the 'church meeting,' and the ex-members of the 'diaconate' and the unsuccessful candidates found it could be worked as a very fairly effective substitute for the official position they had ceased to hold or failed to gain. An ingenious course of persecution, in the shape of accusations brought forward against members of the families of Mr. Martyn's leading adherents, succeeded at last in securing their grand aim, the resignation of the minister. But the crisis led to a *dénouement* considerably other than they had anticipated, for, if some one must go, the congregation preferred to lose the agitators to the minister, and so Mr. Teazer and his particular friends were 'relieved of church membership.'

Mr. Martyn does not say, and we should of course not wish to suggest, that such a state of things as this is normal in Congregationalism. But that it should be possible, and curable only at the expense of a definite schism, is a grave charge to lay at the door of any religious body; and that it is not unique is shown, for instance, by a very similar case reported in the *Guardian* for August 31.

'Mr. Webb, an Independent minister at North Shields, made a written statement in bidding farewell to his congregation. He said that he was led in a moment of moral cowardice to say that he would leave the church as soon as he could, solely because the spirit manifested by two who remained was unbearable. . . . The prospect of the deacons' meetings made him miserable, and the meetings themselves deprived him of hours of sleep. . . . Although the two men referred to had not been alone, they had been the ringleaders in the opposition, as they had in similar circumstances for the last twenty-five years.'

It is not, indeed, exactly for us to complain of this, for the chance of such treatment, especially in a communion intellectually so respectable as Independency, must be a powerful factor in the extraordinary leakage manifest at present from the Nonconformist ministry to the Church of England, and illustrated throughout Mr. Martyn's book, but particularly by the interview he records with the (late) Bishop of Manchester and the categorical statement of the Bishop, that by acceding to all the applications for orders made to him by Nonconformist ministers 'I think I could almost supply this large diocese with curates from their ranks.'

In Mr. Martyn's own case his Preston experiences were doubtless the moving spring of his ultimate secession; for although he enjoyed, after the forcible termination of the disputes, complete immunity from such external troubles, we have his own testimony that they had 'for ever dispelled my illusions concerning Congregationalism.' But it is noteworthy to learn that his doctrinal dissatisfaction with his position arose from a study of the Acts of the Apostles. We have never found it easy to understand how some Nonconformists can appeal so glibly to a book which German rationalists declare cannot certainly be primitive because it is so certainly hierarchical, and it is consoling that in one case at least deeper inquiry has borne its natural fruit.

It is only right to say before we part, as we do with regret, from Mr. Martyn's book, that its humour, though undeniably vigorous—there are several good stories scattered up and down its pages—is not always perfectly refined, and also that it is impossible occasionally not to feel a little irritated at Mr. Martyn's irritation. But it is, no doubt, easier to preach patience under calumny than to practise it.

We note a misprint on p. 288, where the late Ultramontane Bishop of Poitiers, Mgr. Pie, appears as 'Monsignor Fie.'

1. *Revelation, Universal and Special.* By the Rev. WILLIAM W. OLSEN, S.T.D., Professor of Greek and Hebrew, St. Stephen's College, New York. (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1885.)
2. *Religion, a Revelation and a Rule of Life.* By the Rev. WILLIAM KIRKUS, M.A., LL.B., University of London, Rector of the Church of St. Michael and All Angels, Baltimore. (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1886.)

We have received two books from America, both dealing with the subject of Revelation. The object of Dr. Olsen is to find a new argument in support of revelation. He begins by depreciating the old arguments, and showing their inadequacy. He then goes on to show 'that the basis upon which a belief in divine revelation rests is precisely the same as that upon which all knowledge rests.'

When a writer begins his work by exposing the inadequacy of his predecessor's arguments, we naturally demand something which will take their place, and we have consequently examined Dr. Olsen's arguments with considerable care in hopes of finding some contributions of value to Christian apologetics. We are sorry to say we are disappointed.

His aim is to prove that all knowledge comes to us by Revelation, which, he says, is either general or special ; while special Revelation is again divided into objective and subjective. The basis of all knowledge is primarily intuition, which is the source from which we learn our simple moral and social duties, and those beliefs which belong to natural religion. Special revelation rests equally on 'intuition founded on human experience.' It is to it that the nations of the East owe their religious systems ; and the analogy is traced from these up to the Christian Revelation.

Now the whole of this argument is based upon a false analogy and confusion of ideas. Either the Christian Revelation is the same in kind as other Revelations : in that case Dr. Olssen's argument is valid ; but then the special and unique position of Christianity as the direct Revelation of the 'Son of God' on earth must go : or the Christian Revelation is not the same in kind as the other revelations, then there is no real analogy, and Dr. Olssen's argument is invalid. In fact this book is only valuable if Christianity be untrue ; in that case the argument would tend to show that it was the highest and best form of Theism, and deserved a superior position to other religions, which it would resemble in its temporary character and its origin.

Besides, the singular ease with which the author is led astray by false analogies is shown by the chapter on Written Revelations. The first form of this is, according to him, the 'written revelation of the rocks.' Here a metaphorical expression is the cause of the confusion which is fatal to the pretensions of the book.

In his chapter on Intuition he shows that he decidedly misunderstands modern philosophy. He confuses 'right and wrong' with the 'truly beneficial and really injurious.' He triumphantly proves that Herbert Spencer identifies the two (being apparently ignorant of the fact that this is the object of his system) ; he then claims him as a supporter of his views because he admits 'pleasure' to be a necessary intuition. He does not understand that the identification of morality and pleasure destroys morality.

The second book on Revelation which we have received from America appears to us to be much more valuable. In an Appendix on the meaning of the word Revelation the writer shows that, according to correct usage as well as doctrinally, the word ought to be confined to Revelations of God to man, such as that implied by the Christian religion. The main body of the work is intended to show that revelation is necessary to religion, and then to develop the revelation of God in Christ Jesus, revelation in the Christian Church, and revelation as the guide of individual life. In sermons which follow he applies, with considerable vigour and common sense, the principles of revelation. We especially commend to consideration the caution in the sermon on Confession concerning the practical dangers of confession as an unauthorized institution : his remarks show that, if it is to be practised, the safeguards with which Rome has hedged it round are very necessary.

1. *Studies in Italian Literature, Classical and Modern*; also *The Legend of Il Cenacolo*, a Poem. By CATHERINE MARY PHILLIMORE, Writer of the *Life of Fra Angelico*, &c. (London: Sampson Low, Marston and Co., 1887.)
2. *The Warrior Medici, Giovanni delle Bande Nere*. An Historical Study in Florence. From the *Archivio Storico* and Original MSS. in the Magliabecchiana Library. By CATHERINE MARY PHILLIMORE. (London: London Literary Society, 1887.)

MISS PHILLIMORE'S *Studies in Italian Literature* comprises chapters upon Dante, Petrarch, and Tasso amongst the classical, and Manzoni, Aleardi, Arrivabene, and Edoardo Fusco amongst modern authors, besides an account of the Prince Printers of Italy and an elaborate and very interesting sketch of the Italian drama. The book, although entirely composed of papers that have appeared in different periodicals, does not lack unity of subject or lasting interest; and we can cordially recommend it as containing just the amount of information, conveyed in a pleasant style, which many readers would wish to have about the topics which the authoress handles. In comparing the 'Studies' we are disposed to give the palm to the articles on Aleardi and Arrivabene, which were originally published in our own pages; and this opinion is shared by the writer of a thoughtful criticism in the *Academy*.

It is perhaps inevitable that the paper on Dante, although confined to the elucidation of the *Paradiso*, should be hardly as satisfactory as its fellows. The subject is a large one, and requires ample and masterly treatment, such as was impossible within the space permitted by that most despotic of modern autocrats—an editor. Nor do we think that Miss Phillimore has made as much as the subject would have allowed of 'the Prince Printers of Italy.' Two points of minor criticism in this part of the book may be worth attention in view of a subsequent edition. (1) The writer dismisses as erroneous (p. 105 *n.*) the story of silver types; but it is positively asserted that such types were cast by Guillaume Le Bé for Francis I.¹ (2) The great cost of the Vatican printing press is explained (p. 123) by the statement that, *above all*, the most learned men of the age were paid *high salaries* to supervise and correct the editions which issued from it. This does not accord with the detailed accounts of the wretched remuneration commonly paid at this period for similar work throughout Europe.

It can hardly fail to strike the reader of the 'Studies' how mournful was the experience of life which most of the authors, classical and modern alike, were called to traverse. Of the older poets, almost without exception it might be said, 'Fecit indignatio versum;' and whilst literature enjoyed a large measure of courtly patronage in the luxurious petty Italian states, and the drama owed its active existence to the lavish expenditure of princes, and its

¹ It must, however, be owned that the statement has been treated as apocryphal by Renouard in his *Annales de l'Imprimerie des Estienne*, p. 288.

form to the controlling influence of learned Academies, it is unquestionable that the poets, whose undying fame sheds so brilliant a glory over the Italian Peninsula, suffered far more than they benefited at the hands of their capricious masters. Nor did a brighter day dawn for Italian authorship until the establishment of national unity and independence under the gallant house of Savoy.

The varied fortunes of the Italian poets and dramatists are portrayed in these sketches with sympathy and skill, and the interest of the 'Studies' is greatly heightened by spirited translations from the pen of the late Sir Robert Phillimore. It would have been better to have added an English rendering of the other Italian phrases which the volume contains. Few things are more mortifying to the reader than to have the pith and point of a whole paragraph now and again buried beneath the words of an unknown tongue.

Miss Phillimore's second book—*The Warrior Medici*—is a brief and bright historical brochure. The life of Giovanni delle Bande Nere stands out in pleasant relief to the darkness which covers for the most part the period of the hero's career. Craft rather than courage had been the most conspicuous quality of the Medici; but the son of Catarina Sforza inherited no ordinary hardihood. Bold to audacity, dauntless in disaster, the soul of honour, Giovanni is a specimen of the very best stamp of Condottieri chieftains; yet he did not deem it unbefitting his standard of moral rectitude that his sword should be at the command of either side alternately in the struggle of France and Spain upon the field of Italy. It would seem that the code of honour prevalent in his day allowed a partisan captain to hold his military skill as a modern barrister does his forensic ability—at the call of any client who needed his services. With the singular shortsightedness which has bereft the Papacy of many a willing champion, the jealousy of his kinsman Clement VII. deprived the Papal throne and capital of the only general who could have saved them, and effectually marred the greatness which Giovanni might have achieved. We must refer our readers to Miss Phillimore's pages for the details of his gallantry, of the brave succour afforded him by his noble-hearted wife, and of his premature death at the early age of twenty-nine. One feature—unhappily but too rare at that period—of his noble character deserves special mention: his tender regard for the lives of his soldiers. He would never expose them to any danger in which he was not himself the foremost.

We have only to add that both volumes are daintily and attractively got up. We have already said enough to show that the jewels are worthy of their setting.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, SERMONS, PAMPHLETS, ETC.

Outlines of Theological Study, compiled and published with the approval of the Committee of the Conference upon the Training of Candidates for Holy Orders, 1881-1887 (London: George Bell, and Sons, 1887) contains 'Suggestions for the Study of Holy Scripture' and five Syllabuses or Outlines of Theological Study in the Depart-

ment
Apolo
more
for th
bridg
(whos
recom
Colle
what
perio
will s
work
of th
mate
the w
the C
useful
in th
be re
2
geon
Presi
(Lon
of th
tion
coun
exhib
At p
the t
Savo
be es
and
2
(Lon
marv
Chris
alrea
trans
And
Igna
in su
rend
yond
and
Indij
(Lon
temp
dispo
Canc
absol

ments of Dogmatic Theology, Church History, Church Worship, Apologetics, and Christian Ethics. The Conference and Committee more or less directly—but none of them individually—responsible for this publication comprise all the Theological Professors of Cambridge, Oxford, and Durham, the Principal of King's College, London (whose *Boyle Lectures*, we observe, are one of the far too few books recommended as aids to study), and sundry officers of Theological Colleges. A pamphlet of sixty pages seems at first sight to be a somewhat feeble result of a conference of so many specialists during a period of not less than six years. A closer examination, however, will show that such an impression would be hasty and unjust. The work is one which has evidently required and secured no small amount of thoughtful labour. We can only regret, as we have already intimated, that more assistance has not been given to the student in the way of indicating suitable books for mastering each section of the Outlines. In this connection we may express a hope that the useful and able articles which have appeared during the present year in the columns of the *Church Times* on theological aids to study may be reprinted in a separate form.

The Hunterian Oration, delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons of England, February 14, 1887, by William Savory, F.R.S., President of the College, surgeon of St. Bartholomew's Hospital (London, J. and A. Churchill), is an eloquent tribute to the memory of the Father of English Surgery, and a powerful answer to the question with which the oration opens—'What has Hunter done?' Few countries, we imagine, can boast of having two great surgeons who exhibit such high literary skill as Sir James Paget and Mr. Savory. At p. 30 are some admirable remarks on 'specialism'—the false and the true—with which we cordially agree. The point which Mr. Savory seeks to establish is that 'the greatness of John Hunter is to be estimated, not only by what he discovered, but rather by the lesson and example of his work.'

The Ancient and Modern Library of Theological Literature (London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh, 1887) consists of a marvellously cheap reproduction of some of the masterpieces of Christian theology and literature at one shilling each. Among those already issued we find the *De Imitatione* (in a revised and adapted translation), Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living*, the quaint and saintly Andrewes' *Sermons on the Nativity*, and Wilberforce's *Five Empires*. *Ignatius*, *Chrysostom*, *Athanasius* are to be laid under contribution in subsequent volumes. There is no doubt that this series will render accessible to the many, works which have hitherto been beyond the reach of any but the few. The type and paper are good, and a cloth binding will for a long time dispense with any other. *Indifference to Religion, and its Cause*, by the Rev. J. L. Roberts (London: Church of England Pulpit Office), is a thoughtful and temperate sermon, on the dangers of the 'subtle universalism, a disposition to take it for granted that no soul can be lost,' to which Canon Roberts very justly attributes the growing indifference, if not absolute hostility to religion.

Those who are interested—and shame on those who are not interested—in the penitentiary work of the Church will read with great profit *Twenty-three Years in a House of Mercy*, by H. N. (London: Rivingtons, 1887). It is an account of the Kent Penitentiary, known as St. Mary's Home, Stone, Dartford, which practically owes its origin to the Christian zeal and piety of Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P. This little book, written by the superintendent of the Home, is full of deeply interesting facts and stories relating to the unfortunate girls who came under her kind tutelage, and of wise and sober counsels to those who are engaged in or who contemplate undertaking work of the same nature. The Home (which has recently established a branch at Margate) holds sixty penitents, and it is worked by a community of seven or eight ladies, who must have their hands full. Among the wise words with which the volume is jewelled, we note the following: 'To deal successfully with penitents, you want especially *devotion and refinement*' (p. 66). 'Next to the grace of God, *few things are more helpful than a keen sense of humour*' (*ibid.*). Then, as regards the choice of workers, 'Those who "don't get on at home" are the last people one wants in a penitentiary' (p. 65). 'The great need of all our penitentiaries is *classification as to age*' (p. 80). To those who urge the greater importance of preventive work, to the disparagement of penitentiaries, H. N. retorts, 'If your friends and neighbours are struck down by fever, you do not leave them to die while you look after the drains which you know have caused the mischief' (p. 49). We hope this book will meet with a wide circulation.

The Agricultural Depression and the Sufferings of the Clergy, by R. E. Prothero (London: Guardian Office, 1887), is a pamphlet reprinted from our excellent contemporary, the *Guardian*, on a subject of most absorbing interest to all Churchmen. It is written with singular vigour of style, and displays a thorough mastery of facts.

This Church and Realm: a Sermon preached in the Church of All Saints, Margaret Street, at the Anniversary Festival of the English Church Union, on June 16, 1887, by Francis Paget, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and sometime Vicar of Bromsgrove (London: Rivingtons, 1887), is replete with that elevation of tone and severity of style which marks all the utterances of the Professor of Pastoral Theology at the University of Oxford. The object of the sermon is not so much to vindicate the principles and the practice of the English Church Union—which are indeed passed over in silence—as to assert the position of the great Church of England as the historic Church of this country. Dr. Paget thinks that the power of that Church is largely due to the fact that she 'is fearlessly and unapologetically supernatural.' Of the Church this is certainly true, but of a large and we fear increasing number of the clergy it is not less certainly the reverse of the truth.